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1. Introduction

1.1 South Gloucestershire Council submitted its Draft Core Strategy to the Secretary of State on 31st March 2011 for Examination by an independent Inspector. Following the preliminary assessment of the Core Strategy and its supporting documentation and representations, the Inspector has identified a number of concerns that merit further discussion before he decides whether to proceed with the examination into the Plan. The inspector gave notice on 1st June that an Exploratory Meeting (EM) would be held and a draft agenda was issued. This information was published on the Council’s website, an advertisement placed in local newspapers and all stakeholders informed (PA2). On 16th June the Council received further questions from the Inspector (PA3/1). These have also been published on the Council’s website and stakeholders informed by letter/ email dated 16th June (PA3). This paper sets out the Council’s written response to the matters raised by the Inspector in the draft agenda dated 1st June (PA2/1) and the further questions received on 16th June. The purpose of this statement is to provide clarification on the points raised and will inform the way forward for the examination.

Council response to questions raised by Inspector

2.0 Procedural and Legal Compliance (Agenda Item 3)

Q1 Have the necessary stages of plan production been followed and has the process of plan production been fully consistent with development plan regulations?

Officer Response: Yes - South Gloucestershire Council considers it has fulfilled these requirements. The matter of compliance with consultation requirements is set out in more detail in response to question 2.

2.1 The South Gloucestershire Local Development Scheme (LDS) (ED1 and ED2) is a statutory requirement under the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. This identifies the timetable for each of the successive stages involved for preparing the Core Strategy as a series of key milestones. Following amendments by SI 2008/137 (in force from 27th June 2008) (CD3), Part 6 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (CD2) the production of the Core Strategy has essentially proceeded on the basis of a 3 stage process.
Stage 1 Issues and Options – (Regulation 25), May 2008 to February 2010

2.2 Preparation of the Core Strategy took place during 2007 to 2009. This included the Issues and Options Consultation in May 2008 (SD16) and the testing and development of the preferred strategy during 2009. The audit trail for this is set out in the Regulation 30(1)(d) Statement (SD11) and the Regulation 30(1)(e) Statement (SD12), including appendices which are available on our website at http://www.southglos.gov.uk/NR/exeres/f5fe72b6-6edd-4d48-8772-aa16472a5d69

Stage 2 Pre submission Stage – (Regulation 27), June to August 2010

2.3 South Gloucestershire Council published its pre-submission publication draft dated March 2010 Core Strategy (SD1) and carried out consultation between June and August 2010. A public consultation strategy was produced. This was circulated at the Cabinet meeting of 8th March 2010 and made publicly available as a public document at that meeting. A copy is available on our website at http://www.southglos.gov.uk/ Resources/Publications/PTE/11/0200/PTE-11-0063 A detailed explanation of the consultation undertaken is set out under question 2 below.

2.4 The full title of the March 2010 Core Strategy document is the ‘Pre-Submission Publication Draft’. This title was used during the six week consultation period ending on 6th August 2010. The status of the March 2010 Core Strategy is made clear in the document which states:

Para 1.31 “This document is the Publication Version of the Core Strategy. It is the version that the Council proposes to submit to the Secretary of State for independent examination (SGC emphasis) under the terms of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.”

Para 1.32 “The role of the Publication Version document is to provide the opportunity for comments – which are known as representations, to be made before it is submitted to the Secretary of State.” (SGC emphasis)

2.5 It is therefore clear that it was, and was intended to be, the proposed submission document. Moreover, it is clear from resolutions of the South Gloucestershire Cabinet and Full Council that authority was given to officers to proceed to stages 2 and 3. In his letter to Mr Crysell (Appendix 1) Cllr John Calway, Leader of the Council has further confirmed he was absolutely clear that he and his Cabinet were being asked to approve the Submission Core Strategy and understood that this was in accordance with Regulation 27.

2.6 It is accepted that the 8th March 2010 Cabinet Report did not specifically record that the consultation at the Pre-submission stage was being carried out under, or for the purposes of Regulation 27. However, at no stage were any references made to the 2004 Regulations. Instead the references were made to ‘publishing the Core Strategy’ and to ‘advancing the Core Strategy in accordance with the...
2.7 The Council has a commitment to use plain English and to make our formal reports as simple and as straightforward as possible. The LDS (ED1 and ED2) clearly identified each stage of the process as already explained. By not referring directly to statutory instruments and regulations we have actually made the Core Strategy easier to engage with and understand.

2.8 For all the reasons set out above, this was what we consider the Regulations required us to do and the necessary authority to act and clarity was contained in the March 2010 Cabinet report. We therefore stand by paragraph 1.23a of the Submission Core Strategy that the March 2010 document was the Submission Core Strategy.

**Stage 3 Submission Stage – (Regulation 30), 31st March 2011**

2.9 South Gloucestershire Council formally submitted the Core Strategy to the Secretary of State on the 31st March 2011. The submission, in accordance with the requirements of Regulations 30(1)(a – g) and 30(2), included the following:

- The Core Strategy (SD1);
- The Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal SD6/1, SD7/1
- The changes required to the Proposals Map (SD5)
- A statement setting out – (SD11 and SD11/1 – SD11/5)
  - Which bodies and persons were invited to make representation during the preparation of the Core Strategy;
  - How those bodies and persons were invited to make such representations;
  - A summary of the main issues raised by those representation; and
  - How the issues have been addressed in the Core Strategy.
- A statement setting out – (SD12 and SD12/1)
  - The number of representations received to the Pre-Submission Publication Draft Core Strategy; and
  - A summary of the main issues raised in those representations.
- Copies of all representations; and
- All the supporting documents that the authority considered relevant to the preparation of the Core Strategy.

2.10 In accordance with Regulation 30(3) the Council, as soon as was practicable after submission to the Secretary of State:
made copies of the Core Strategy and submission documents available online and available from the places at which the proposed submission documents were available under regulation 27(a). The following link to our website explains this. (http://www.southglos.gov.uk/NR/exeres/17f81db0-8972-44b8-9447-cc9c6231255d );

published a statement on the website setting out that the Core Strategy and submission documents had been submitted to the Secretary of Statement. This statement also set out where and when they could be inspected (http://www.southglos.gov.uk/NR/exeres/17f81db0-8972-44b8-9447-cc9c6231255d ).

wrote to or emailed every specific and general consultation body invited to make representations during the preparation of the Core Strategy, on the 14th April 2011. The Council also contacted all persons on its consultation database whom had registered an interest in receiving information of topics addressed by the Core Strategy. In order to notify them all that the Core Strategy and submission documents had been submitted and where and when they could be inspected. A web link (www.southglos.gov.uk/corestrategy) was given to provide access to copies of the submission documents and the Core Strategy. (http://www.southglos.gov.uk/NR/exeres/17f81db0-8972-44b8-9447-cc9c6231255d ).

advertised the fact that the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy and submission documents had been submitted to the Secretary of State in the Gazette Series and Evening Post Newspapers on the 14th April 2011. The advertisement provided details of the subject matter of the Core Strategy, the area it covered, and provided information on where and when the Core Strategy and submission documents could be inspected. (http://www.southglos.gov.uk/NR/exeres/17f81db0-8972-44b8-9447-cc9c6231255d ).

Compliance with other Regulations

2.11 Regulation 9 – requires the Local Development Scheme to specify that the Proposals Map will be revised following adoption or approval of any DPD. The South Gloucestershire LDS (EB2) sets this out at paragraph 54.

2.12 Regulation 14 – in respect of the Core Strategy this regulation applies at the time of adoption. This stage has not yet been reached, however once the Core Strategy is adopted the Proposals Map will be revised to geographically illustrate the application of the Core Strategy policies

Habitats Regulations Assessment

2.13 A Habitats Regulations Assessment’ (HRA) has been prepared as part of the Core Strategy submission documents. Natural England has confirmed that the HRA meets their expectations. This is set out in their letter dated 7th April 2011 (SD9). This matter was communicated to Nabarro who have indicated by letter 7th
April 2011 SD1/8 that their objections to the plan on the basis of non compliance with the HRA requirements has now been withdrawn.

Policy CS25

2.14 With regard to the specific challenge relating to policy CS25, the Core Strategy has correctly complied with guidance in Section 4 of PPS12 (NP8). The Council maintains the view that Policy CS25 is a strategic spatial policy that relates to the needs of the communities of the north fringe of Bristol and is not a 'site-allocation policy' in respect of the Abbey Wood Retail Park. Indeed, looking at the Plan as a whole, the policies do not allocate anything specific to Abbey Wood, but rather state in broad terms that the area will be enhanced to promote vitality, to be more 'people friendly' and to include a wider range of retail uses. As such, the objectives are spatial and design-based to provide an indicative framework for delivery of those objectives.

2.15 It is not the purpose of the policy to provide any specific allocation in respect of the Retail Park site. To read the policy in any other way than this, would make it necessary to make a whole host of site allocations with regard to other elements of Policy CS25. This is plainly not the case with a spatial policy of this nature and it would be wholly wrong to do so. The Council therefore considers that the representations made by Britel Fund Trustees Limited regarding the Retail Park in the Core Strategy as a town or district centre should remain matters for the Inspector to consider. Notwithstanding this, South Gloucestershire Council remains open to find a constructive way forward with Mr Kentish and Britel. We remain of the view there is scope to achieve this through the EiP process. Initial pre-application discussions have been held with Mr Kentish and the Council’s has given initial positive feedback on a without prejudice basis.

Q2 Has there been adequate consultation carried out at the appropriate stages for all aspects of the Plan including the Proposals Map?

Officer response: Yes

2.16 Consultation has been carried out in accordance with both the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement and the regulations, as required by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (CD1).

2.17 The Council adopted a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (EB3) in May 2008 which sets out how the Council will involve the wider community in the preparation of the Core Strategy and in the delivery of the vision and objectives of the Core Strategy. These processes meet the regulations set out in the 2004 Act (CD1) and the guidance in PPS12.

2.18 In accordance with SCI, the Council has been actively involved in consultation and engagement with the community and stakeholders since the commencement of work on the Core Strategy in early 2007 as follows:
2.19 Details of the early consultation and engagement activities are set out in the March 2010 Pre-issues and Options Engagement Statement (SD11/1). Activities included a residents’ questionnaire, a letter to everyone on the Council’s LDF database, meetings and workshops. The purpose of this consultation and engagement was to seek views on the issues which the Core Strategy should address, to raise awareness of the Core Strategy, and to promote and develop an understanding of the role of the Core Strategy.

2.20 Consultation on Issues and Options marks the first formal stage of consultation, and was carried out in accordance with regulation 25 of the 2004 regulations. The Council invited comments on the Issues and Options document between 2nd May and 13th June 2008 (subsequently extended to 11th July). Full details of the consultation exercise are set out in the March 2010 Core Strategy Issues and Options Document Engagement Statement (SD11/2). In addition to the availability and publicity of the issues and Options document, consultation activities included public exhibitions, workshops, meetings with groups and press articles. Approximately 1,900 responses were received to the Issues and Options consultation.

2.21 The Council continued to engage with the wider community following the end of the formal Issues and Options consultation, conducting further consultation activities in accordance with PPS12 and Regulation 25 of the 2008 amendment regulations. The main focus of these activities was visioning and place making to inform the Pre-Submission Core Strategy and preferred development strategy, through exhibitions and community led workshops. Full details of the activities undertaken are set out in the Post Issues and Options Engagement Statement (SD11/4).

2.22 The main Regulation 27 consultation took place between 26th May and 6th August 2010. In addition to the requirements of this regulation the Council advertised more widely and held a series of public exhibitions. Details of the consultation undertaken is set out in Engagement and Consultation Statement 8th March 2010 to 23rd March 2011 (SD12/1).

2.23 Further consultation was undertaken in Jan/Feb 2011 and March/May 2011 to ensure all stakeholders were kept informed of progress on the Core Strategy and given the opportunity to comment on the Proposed Changes and Further Proposed Changes. Although this was not a requirement of the regulations, it did however provide the opportunity for consultation on the Proposals Map changes which had been omitted in error from the earlier Regulation 27 consultation. Full details of all the Pre-Submission consultation activities are set out in Core Strategy Consultation and engagement Statement (SD12/1).
2.24 Changes made in December 2010 and March 2011 were not substantive. We consider these amendments are focused changes and/or minor editorial revisions. They do not go to the heart of the plan and do not alter the Plan’s vision, spatial objectives, development strategy, overall quantum or location of development. In this respect, the changes made were in response to the changing national planning policy context following the General Election in May 2010 and to issues raised by our communities following public consultation, that provide further clarification and explanation, without altering the substance of the Plan. The decision to undertake further consultation was motivated by the Council’s commitment to ensure full engagement and community involvement in accordance with the objectives of our SCI. Consequently, following approval by Council and Cabinet in December 2010, Proposed Changes were publicised for 6 weeks up to 18th February 2011 and the following undertaken:

- an addendum (SD3) to the published plan was prepared setting out the proposed changes,
- the Sustainability Appraisal (SD7) was reviewed and updated accordingly; and
- people and organisations were consulted on the addendum (as set out in Appendix 2 of the Regulation 30(1)(e) Statement (SD12/1) to allow them a full opportunity to consider the proposed changes and put forward comments before the Core Strategy was formally submitted.

2.25 Comments received during the January/February 2011 consultation were forwarded to the Secretary of State as part of the Submission Core Strategy. Comments received to the March/May 2011 consultation have also been forwarded to the Inspector.

2.26 The Council does not dispute that changes to the Proposals Map were not consulted on at the time the Publication Core Strategy was published in March 2010. However, this was corrected in December 2010 when all the changes to the Proposals Map arising both from the Publication Core Strategy over the previous summer and from consultation responses to this document were identified and consultation was undertaken in January and February 2011 – see Changes to the Proposals Map December 2010 (SD5).

2.27 Moreover, the proposed alterations to the proposals map are of a minor nature and are not considered material as set out below:

- Consequential changes to show where Local Plan policies will be replaced by Core Strategy policies following adoption of the Core Strategy. This is set out in Table 1 of document SD5 at pages 3-5. In essence this is simply a re-classification of referencing from the SGLP to the Core Strategy. No changes in boundaries or designations arise as a result.
- Changes to the Proposals Map arising from 4 policies contained in Part 2 of the Core Strategy – policies CS26, CS27, CS28 and CS31. This is set out in Table 2 of document SD5 at page 6. In essence this transposes to the Proposal Map information contained in the March 2010 Core Strategy at
figures 6, 7, 8, and 12. There can be no doubt as to the location and extend of the strategic sites proposed given the illustrative material in the written document.

- Alterations required in relation to the safeguarded employment sites. This is set out in Table 3 of document SD5 at pages 7-10 and Appendix 1. The vast majority of these sites are already identified on the SGLP Proposals Map and the amendments proposed are minor cartographical changes to reflect factual updating and for clarification purposes.

- Alterations required in relation to the safeguarded Gypsy and Traveller sites. This is set out in Table 4 of document SD5 at pages 11-12 and Appendix 2. These sites are already identified in the SGLP but due to an historical anomaly were omitted from the Proposals Map. This was inadvertently overlooked, hence the correction made.

2.28 Officers consider that appropriate and adequate consultation has been carried out throughout the preparation of the Core Strategy. In our opinion given the steps that have been taken to rectify the matter of the non-publication of the Proposal Maps for consultation in June – August 2010, no useful purpose can now be served to prevent the Core Strategy proceeding to examination bearing in mind that consultation has now been done. Further, the proposed changes and further proposed changes are not material changes to the information contained in the Pre-Submission Publication Core Strategy.

Q3 Does the Plan introduce matters of detail which should be deferred to a subsequent Development Plan Document (DPD)?

Officer Response. No

2.29 The Core Strategy has fully taken account of and applied government guidance set out in PPS12 (NP8) regarding the purpose of local spatial planning, how it benefits communities and the key matters that Core Strategies should address.

2.30 PPS12 at paragraph 4.5 advises that the Core Strategy should make clear spatial choices about where development should go in broad terms, both to reduce the need for other DPDs and to inform decisions on planning applications.

2.31 PSS 12 also makes clear at paragraph 4.6 that Core Strategies may allocate strategic sites for development. The test of what constitutes a strategic site is defined as those sites considered central to the achievement of the plan’s strategy. The identification of strategic sites for the purposes of our Core Strategy therefore goes beyond any single developer land holding interests. Instead, it relies more on establishing an overall development vision for the delivery of the growth agenda, place making objectives, community engagement and involvement and working with stakeholders to identify the physical, social and
green infrastructure needed to deliver sustainable mixed and balanced communities.

2.32 This approach is reflected in Chapters 11 to 17 of the Core Strategy which contain 11 ‘place making’ polices that will effectively guide future investment and other plans, policies and programmes to achieve strong and prosperous sustainable communities in each of the six spatial areas of the district. This therefore complies with the PPS12 requirement for Core Strategies to be spatial in nature and to set out a strategy to deliver their overall vision and key objectives. The Council’s specific approach to planning for Filton Airfield is addressed in response to Agenda item 6.

2.33 Officers therefore consider that the identification of strategic sites and the level of detail contained in Policies CS25 to CS33 is proportionate and commensurate with the requirements of PPS12 for the following reasons. First, it provides a justified approach for where strategic growth will take place, bringing certainty and clarity to the plan process. Second, it demonstrates how this will achieve the Council’s and communities’ requirements for sustainable communities in accordance with the Core Strategy’s vision, spatial objectives and development strategy. Third, it provides an effective policy framework which can be more precisely defined through master planning work and eventual delivery. Finally, by providing this high level policy guidance in the Core Strategy, rather than a subsequent DPD, the Council is ensuring effective delivery in accordance with the Plan led approach, while avoiding any unnecessary delay in bringing development forward.

2.34 The Council has been working very successfully with its developer partners to take forward this strategic approach through the Core Strategy, complemented by more detailed guidance being developed through the site specific SPD, which will guide master planning work. They very much welcome this approach, particularly since it avoids unnecessary delay to delivery, while providing an effective framework for full and effective community involvement and engagement. We are therefore confident that the right amount of detail is included in the Core Strategy to enable effective and timely delivery through the SPD/ master planning process as set out in the Local Development Scheme (EB1).

2.35 This approach was endorsed by feedback the Council received to its two advisory visits held in May 2008 and December 2009. Both inspectors who undertook these assessments supported the approach the Council was taking to identify strategic sites in its Core Strategy and how the Plan’s overall vision, spatial objectives and development strategy was being taken forward and expressed through the Plan’s policy framework. Moreover, the Adopted Statement of Community Involvement (EB3) (at paragraph 4.26 and Appendix 7) advocates that strategic sites should be delivered through the Local Development Framework/ Core Strategy and sets out the process for how the Council will take this forward.
Q4  Is the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) comprehensive and does it comply with the requirements of the EU Directive on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA Directive 2001/42/EC) and associated Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (SI No. 1633) in identifying and explaining what reasonable alternatives to the proposed policies have been considered and why they have been rejected?  (For further information see:  Save Historic Newmarket Ltd v. Forest Heath District Council [2011] EWHC 606.)

Officer Response: Yes

2.36 The production of the Core Strategy’s suite of Sustainability Appraisal (SA) documents has fully complied with the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive and Regulations. The following documents comprise the SA of the Core Strategy:

- Local Development Framework Scoping Report 2008 (SD15);
- Initial SA Report 2008 – to accompany the Core Strategy Issues & Options document (SD17 and SD18);
- Draft SA Report of the Pre-Submission Publication Draft Core Strategy March 2010 (SD6/1 and SD7/1); and
- SA Report to support the Submission Core Strategy, March 2010 with December 2010 updates (SD5 and SD6).

2.37 As the purpose of the 2008 Scoping Report is to establish baseline data and the SA Objectives this document is not considered further.

2.38 The Core Strategy Issues & Options document 2008 (SD16) set out a number of options for urban extensions which were appraised in the accompanying Initial SA Report (SD17 and SD18). While the Initial SA Report appraised those options, it made no recommendations about which, if any, should be rejected. No policies were presented in the Core Strategy Issues & Options document and therefore no policies were appraised in the Initial SA Report.

2.39 The appraisals of urban extension alternatives in the Initial SA Report were used to inform the production of the March 2010 Sustainability Appraisal of the Pre-Submission Publication Draft Core Strategy (SD6/1 and SD7/1). This document explained in detail in Section 3 and Appendices 7, 8 and 9 the reasons for rejecting a number of options for urban extensions that had been present in the Issues & Options document, including the rejection of the East Fringe of Bristol urban extension for example. This section and appendices also demonstrated why the options chosen for inclusion in the Pre-Submission Publication Draft were the most sustainable when tested against the SA objectives.

2.40 Section 5 of the March 2010 SA Report appraised all policies in the Draft Core Strategy, apart from those that directly related to urban extensions and development in Thornbury (these were appraised elsewhere as detailed above). Each policy was tested against the reasonable alternative of a ‘no policy’ scenario
and clearly explained in each case the reasons for rejecting the ‘no policy’ alternative.

2.41 A further SA Report was produced to accompany the December 2010 Proposed Changes Core Strategy (SD6 and SD7). This SA Report was an updated version of the March 2010 SA Report, that responded to representations made during the summer 2010 public consultation and also made other factual updates. The December SA report considered whether there would be any significant effects on sustainability arising from the proposed changes and concluded there would not be.

2.42 For these reasons, officers consider that the Sustainability Appraisal Reports produced by the Council have fully complied with all relevant European SEA requirements. When taken together to form the ‘Environmental Report’ as required under the SEA Directive, the documents demonstrate a clear audit trail for how options have been tested and why reasonable alternatives have been rejected.

2.43 In relation to Save Historic Newmarket Ltd v. Forest Heath District Council [2011] EWHC 606 this is a case which turned on its own specific facts, where the Core Strategy initially provided for an urban extension of 500 houses which subsequently grew to 1200 houses and in respect of which no strategic environmental assessment (SEA) of that growth or alternatives to it were considered. That situation does not pertain to this Core Strategy.
3.0 Housing (Agenda Item 4)

Q1 There are obvious tensions between the Council's housing strategy and the figures proposed in the draft RS and in the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes, 2008. Having regard to the status of the draft RS and the Proposed Changes, what are the implications of the most recent Court of Appeal judgement\(^1\) for the Council's strategy?

Officer Response: There are no additional new implications following this most recent Court of Appeal judgement for the Council's strategy.

3.1 In accordance with section 24(1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 the Core Strategy is required to be in general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). For the purpose of this requirement the statutory regional strategy is Regional Planning Guidance for the South West (RGP10).

3.2 The Council considers that the Core Strategy is in general conformity with the regional strategy, RPG10, in respect of the housing and spatial strategy for the following reasons:

- Policy VIS1 of RPG10: Expressing the Vision of RPG, is conformed with in that the Core Strategy promotes a sustainable pattern of development, minimises the need to travel, seeks better integration between urban and rural areas, concentrates growth at the Principal Urban Area (PUA) and sets visions and objections for towns and rural areas across the district.

- The overall development strategy set out in the Core Strategy accords with Policy SS1: Regional Spatial Strategy, Policy SS2: Regional Development Strategy and Policy TRAN 1: Reducing the Need to Travel of RPG10, through promoting economic prosperity and focusing future development in sustainable locations such as the Principal Urban Area (PUA) and Market Towns of Yate/Chipping Sodbury and Thornbury.

- Policy HO1: Level of Housing Demand 1996 - 2016, of RPG10 requires the former county of Avon to deliver 3,700 dwellings per annum. The South Gloucestershire Local Plan, adopted 2006, transposes this RPG10 figure to a requirement for South Gloucestershire which amounted to 1,184 dwellings per annum. In effect uplifting the housing provision set for South Gloucestershire at Policy 33 of Joint Replacement Structure Plan (SD12/5) while maintaining the 30% apportionment of housing in line with JRSP requirement for South Gloucestershire in comparison with the other 3 unitary authorities. The Core Strategy’s annual housing delivery requirement is 1,075 (21,500/20years), this is within 10% of the RPG10 annualised requirement and therefore considered to be in general conformity.

---

\(^1\) Cala Homes (South) Limited and Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and Another (May 2011)
3.3 It is our understanding that the recent Court of Appeal judgement states that it is unlawful to have regard to the intention to abolish the regional strategy in preparing a DPD and as such there is a requirement that the DPD be in general conformity with the regional strategy. In the case of South Gloucestershire this means that the Core Strategy should be in general conformity with RPG10 – as the adopted regional strategy, not the draft RS which has never and is very unlikely to ever become part of the adopted development plan.

3.4 All work on the RSS was effectively halted in 2008 after the publication of Proposed Changes (LR8/2) following the legal challenge to the South East RS. It is therefore very unlikely it ever will have the status of the adopted development plan. Consequently the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy is not required to be in general conformity with the draft RS or the proposed changes 2008 document. Therefore the most recent Court of Appeal judgement has no additional implications for progressing the Core Strategy to examination. These matters were fully considered and recognised in the appeal decision re Land at Williams Green, Longwell Green APP/P0119/A/10/2138335 March 16 2011.

3.5 Therefore it is both lawful and appropriate for the Council to take account of the Government’s intention to abolish the RS in considering the weight to be attached to the RS Proposed Changes 2008, which is not a document that the Core Strategy has to be in general conformity with.

Q2 Is there sufficient, robust evidence to support the Council’s alternative housing target? How closely does this accord with the approach advocated in paragraph 33 of PPS3?

Officer Response: Yes

3.6 This approach is set out in the Council’s technical paper Justification for the Strategy for Housing to 2026 (EB21) which forms part of the plan’s evidence base. This paper sets out the rationale behind the approach to the overall level of housing provision and the spatial distribution of growth in the submission South Gloucestershire Core Strategy. While it is not the purpose of the EM to discuss the merits of this evidence, the Council considers it has robustly evidenced the housing requirement as set out in the technical paper and can substantiate the Core Strategy housing requirement with particular reference to:

- The economic forces driving many of the assumptions that underpinned the RS have now significantly altered. Changing economic circumstances now indicate significantly less job growth than assumed by the draft RS. Based on revised economic job forecasts which the Council consider are robust and appropriate, as set out in Appendix 2 of the Housing Paper, 21,500 dwellings proposed in the strategy for development would result in a ratio of new dwellings to jobs of between 1.6 and 0.98. This is considered to provide sufficient scope for accommodating future economic growth in South Gloucestershire.
Given the constrained public investment over the coming decade and possible consequential review of sub-regional growth priorities, it is not realistic to expect the delivery of the necessary transport infrastructure to support the stalled draft RS ambitions for an additional 8000 new homes in a major urban extension on the Bristol East Fringe. A further technical statement is attached at Appendix 3.

3.7 Our approach to justifying the housing requirement closely accords with the approach advocated in PPS3 (NP3). With the exception of advice from the National Housing and Planning Advice Unit which was abolished in June 2010, the Council’s technical housing paper has followed paragraph 33 of PPS3 with regard to taking account of evidence of current and future levels of needs and demand for housing and affordability in determining the local housing provision based upon:

- SHMA (SD11/3)
- The Government’s latest published household and population projections
- Economic growth forecasts

3.8 Officers consider this provides sufficient clarification for the inspector to progress to the Examination and test through the hearing sessions.

Q3 What is the Council’s position regarding the latest ONS household projections?

Officer Response: Household and population projections are a recognised element of establishing the housing requirement. The Council considers that the Government’s latest official projections for South Gloucestershire are likely to over inflate the level of future household growth in the district. The Council has had regard to this and has addressed the matter in the Housing Justification paper: [http://www.southglos.gov.uk/_Resources/Publications/PTE/11/0200/PTE-11-0066](http://www.southglos.gov.uk/_Resources/Publications/PTE/11/0200/PTE-11-0066)

3.9 For clarification, household projections are produced by DCLG – ONS provide the underlying population projections.

3.10 The Government’s official household projections are published by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG). The latest set of household projections; the 2008-based projections (published 26 November 2010) suggest that the number of households in South Gloucestershire will increase by 32,000 over the Core Strategy Plan period (2006 to 2026).

3.11 The DCLG household projections are highly dependent on the level and structure of population generated by the underlying ONS trend based population projections, the latest of which; the 2008 based projections (published on 27 May 2010), suggest that that the population of South Gloucestershire will increase by 56,100 over the period 2006-2026.

3.12 The 2008 based population projections suggest that the population of the district will increase at a higher and more consistent rate than has been experienced in
the past, as set out in the Housing Justification paper at: http://www.southglos.gov.uk/_Resources/Publications/PTE/11/0200/PTE-11-0066

The Council has raised concerns that the annual population change derived from the 2008 based projections is higher than historic ‘actual’ annual population changes observed in official ONS mid year population estimates published over the last three decades. This is despite the fact that the District experienced significant levels of household growth during this period.

3.13 Furthermore, it should also be noted that the most recent ONS mid year population estimate for 2009 (262,200) is approximately 1,000 lower than the comparable figure for 2009 derived from the 2008 based projections (263,200). Although comparison between ONS estimates and projections is only possible for the 2008/09 year, the variance between the ONS estimates and projections further suggests that the 2008 based projections overestimate the likely level of future population growth locally.

3.14 In accordance with paragraph 33 of PPS3, the Council has taken into consideration evidence of past housing completion rates. The growth rates for the district set out in the DCLG 2008 based household projections (32,000 for the period 2006-2026) represents an annualised completion rate of 1,600 dpa. Analysis of local historic housing completions over the last 30 years demonstrates that this rate has only been achieved in 4 of the last 30 years. These high levels of completions were achieved during the four years of peak delivery of Bradley Stoke when 40 sites were being delivered by house building firms – collectively building homes at a rate of 848 homes per year. However, the full capacity of 8,000 homes on green field land at Bradley Stoke took 20 years to complete. Further analysis is provided at paragraphs 23 and 24 of the Housing Justification paper: http://www.southglos.gov.uk/_Resources/Publications/PTE/11/0200/PTE-11-0066

3.15 Mindful of the historic problems of undersupply, the Council is very aware of the need to provide an adequate supply of housing land and is working closely with developer partners to renegotiate planning obligations and bring forward permitted sites where development has stalled due to the current economic circumstances. Notwithstanding this, based on developers’ own assessment of future delivery, it is highly unlikely that build rates and the scale of construction activity that was seen at Bradley Stoke twenty years ago, can be replicated for each year up to 2026.

3.16 Officers are therefore of the view that the Government’s figures are over inflated and do not provide a true indication of future population and household demand.
Q4 How do you reconcile the housing targets in the CS with the Government's agenda on 'Planning for Growth' and the ambitions of the West of England Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) for the region?

Officer Response: The Council recognises the ambition and objectives of both the Government and the LEP within the context of the Council’s commitment to sustainable patterns of development ensuring that growth is supported with the required levels of infrastructure provision.

3.17 The Core Strategy was at an advanced stage of preparation when the LEP was formed and the Government published its Ministerial Statement. Notwithstanding this, the Core Strategy recognises the ambition and objectives of both the Government and the LEP within the context of the Council’s commitment to sustainable patterns of development ensuring that growth is supported with the required levels of infrastructure provision.

3.18 South Gloucestershire has responded to the inspector’s request for comments to be made to the Ministerial Statement Planning for Growth (SG3/1). This was provided to the Inspector on 7th June and is published on the Council’s website at http://www.southglos.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/6C22B9E4-6A2F-410C-A785-A7AA6DCEFE8/0/PTE110128.pdf.

3.19 South Gloucestershire has experienced major development over the last 30 years. The Core Strategy recognises that the council not only has to deal with the imbalance inherited from the past, but also not to exacerbate or add to these problems when it plans for the future. A key policy driver of the SGLP (LR1), West of England Vision (EB45) and Core Strategy has been seeking to reconcile that balance between homes and jobs in South Glos.

3.20 We understand the ambitions of the LEP. South Gloucestershire Council fully understands the importance of economic growth and job creation to the wealth and social health of the nation. However, we also consider that growth that is not supported by the necessary investment in supporting infrastructure and which significantly impacts on the environmental assets and characteristics of the District is unlikely to deliver the intended economic benefits and may actually undermine not just these objectives being achieved, but the wider economic priorities as a result.

3.21 We very much consider that the Council’s actions through its working practices, high level vision and the development of the Core Strategy’s development strategy and policy framework will help to deliver to the Ministerial Statement by:

- promoting sustainable economic growth and jobs;
- enabling economic growth to proceed as easily as possible while not compromising key sustainable development principles and protecting the Green Belt;
- providing an up to date, robust, flexible and fair planning policy framework that is pro-active and positive;
- fully recognising environmental issues as an integral part of sustainable development;
- being evidence based and responsive to communities aspirations; and
• prepared jointly with our communities and partners to focus on what we can do.

3.22 The Council has a proven record of working with communities, statutory organisations, neighbouring authorities and development partners to bring forward sustainable development. It is supportive of economic growth and is delivery focused.

3.23 The timely adoption of the Core Strategy will provide the necessary clarity and assurance to the development industry to ensure that it can bring forward the planned economic growth.

**Q5** Is there not a serious risk that constraints on housing supply would undermine economic prospects for the area and how, if at all, have you factored in the housing pressures in the wider sub-region?

Officer Response: No

3.24 Officers consider that the housing requirement established by the Core Strategy effectively balances the requirements of PPS3 (NP3) at paragraph 10 with the Council’s commitment to sustainable patterns of development by ensuring that growth is supported with the required levels of infrastructure provision. To imply that the Core Strategy has failed to deliver PPS3 housing objectives relating to quantity of housing required, would be to risk setting aside the other housing policy objectives within PPS3 relating to sustainability and quality of place which are equally valid.

3.25 The Council recognises that projections of future changes to the population and economy are subject to significant uncertainties. For example, a higher rate of economic growth could result in a greater need for housing and/or employment land. Conversely, a lower rate of economic growth could have the opposite effect. There is, therefore, a case for suggesting a flexible and balanced approach.

3.26 As set out in responses to Questions 2 and 4, levels of economic growth and infrastructure investment are now considerably lower than previous forecasts used to support the RS. The impact of this is that the housing requirement should now reflect the context of revised economic growth forecasts and a realistic assessment of the expected levels of infrastructure investment. This applies to the housing requirement for South Gloucestershire and equally applies to the wider sub-region. The RS is no longer being taken forward therefore each unitary authority in the sub-region is responsible for setting its own housing requirement. In accordance with the principles of localism it is important the sovereign the responsibilities of each LPA is respected. South Gloucestershire considers its approach takes into account of the economic prospects for the area within the wider objectives of the West of England and is in general conformity with RPG10.

3.27 Finally, South Gloucestershire has worked closely with the other unitarity authorities in the West of England with regard to addressing housing pressures in
the wider sub-region. A key area of focus has been to resolve infrastructure deficits and stalled development sites and planning applications. The West of England Delivery and Infrastructure Investment Plan (RD22) identifies a comprehensive strategy to guide future development and ensures that the objectives, issues and key sites are not considered in isolation, particularly where these have cross boundary implications. Through this work, as part of the West of England, South Gloucestershire has been able to address housing pressures. The is illustrated most clearly in the way HCA resources were directed to enable the early delivery of the New Filton Road linking Cribbs Causeway and the A38 which is a element of infrastructure to support the Northfield (Charlton Hayes) development.

Q6 More generally, is there flexibility in the CS to cope with unexpected change?

Officer Response: Yes

3.28 The Core Strategy includes an overall vision, and spatial area visions and objectives that make the Core Strategy flexible and able to cope with unexpected change. In respect of housing delivery this flexibility is expressed in a number of ways.

1) Policy CS5 expresses in policy terms the plan’s strategy for the location of development. Flexibility in housing supply is identified at criteria 1 bullet point 3 where additional contingency land with the potential for up to 1500 dwellings west of the A4018 at Cribbs/ Patchway is identified.

2) the Plan also makes provision for up to 3000 houses at north Yate. A phasing trajectory at Policy CS15 indicates 2,400 up to 2026, however this could be adjusted through the application of plan, monitor and manage if required.

3) Policy CS25 supports the redevelopment of Frenchay Hospital for mixed use development including residential development. This is capable of delivering up to 500 dwellings.

4) following the recent announcement by BAe Systems that Filton Airfield is to close in December 2012, the Council considers that subject to further detailed technical work and community involvement, this location could provide additional opportunities for up to 3000 dwellings. Further information on Filton Airfield is set out in response to the inspector’s questions to agenda item 6. Therefore as currently drafted, the Core Strategy has sufficient flexibility to respond to strengthening housing market and economic conditions.

3.29 The Core Strategy also demonstrates flexibility to support economic regeneration. Policy CS12 identifies the areas safeguarded for economic development. As part of Policy CS12 at Table 2, the Council has identified some existing employment areas which will be subject to review. The policy objective is to safeguard these sites until their long term future is clearer. The Council is promoting this approach as it recognises the changing and challenging market conditions and the need for
the Core Strategy to be adaptable and able to respond to help deliver economic
development and encourage job creation.

Q7 Are there outstanding issues with site delivery? I am concerned that there
may be gaps in the detail on some aspects of the strategic allocations in the CS in
terms of infrastructure provision, flood risk etc which could jeopardise plan
delivery? In short, is there sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the proposals
are achievable?

Officer response: The Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Delivery statement set out
what infrastructure is required to enable delivery of the objectives of the Core Strategy
and the means by which this will be delivered, in line with advice in PPS12. This
includes site specific infrastructure requirements, where these are of a strategic or
spatial nature or involve a different agency for delivery.

3.30 PPS12 at paragraphs 4.8 to 4.12 states that infrastructure planning is essential to
the preparation of core strategies and advises that the infrastructure planning
process should inform core strategies and should be part of a robust evidence
base. The test in PPS12 is whether there is a reasonable prospect for delivery of
the infrastructure necessary to support the development of strategic sites.

3.31 PPS12 at paragraph 4.45 further advises that infrastructure planning needed to
support the Core Strategy is:

- Based on sound infrastructure delivery planning
- There are no regulatory or national planning policy barriers
- Partners who are essential to the delivery of the strategy are signed up
- Be coherent with core strategies prepared by neighbouring authorities,
  where cross boundary issues are relevant.

3.32 The Council’s approach and rationale for strategic sites is set out in Q1(3) above.
To support the identification of strategic sites in the Core Strategy officers have
undertaken infrastructure planning in accordance with the requirements of
PPS12. This can be summarised as follows:

- The Council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) has been prepared in line
  with the guidance set out in PPS12 and forms part of the evidence base for
  South Gloucestershire’s Core Strategy document. It gives a broad
  indication of the required physical, social and green infrastructure, the
  planned provision, cost and delivery mechanism for infrastructure across
  the area until 2026 to support planned new development. This includes new
  infrastructure necessary to deliver and service the development of the
  strategic housing sites. It is therefore sound and complies with PPS12.

- Each of the new neighbourhoods and the housing opportunity area has
  been the subject of a Sustainability Appraisal (SA). The SA’s carried out by
  the Council during the preparation of the Core Strategy examined the broad
  potential housing areas and the specific sites proposed by developers and
  measured these against the agreed criteria set out in Table Two of the SA
Scoping Report. We are therefore confident that our SA work demonstrates there are no regulatory or national planning policy barriers to the delivery of the strategic housing sites.

- Through the Core Strategy preparation, officers have established that all of the proposed new neighbourhoods and strategic housing sites are available for development, are capable of being delivered and can be delivered within the core strategy period. The Council’s early work with development partners, (particularly for those housing sites that will be delivered early in the plan period), has identified the strategic issues to be overcome. Technical work by the Planning Authority and by development partners has demonstrated that the chosen sites have the capacity to deliver the required housing numbers and that there are no barriers to delivery.

3.33 This is presented in more detail in the New Neighbourhoods Delivery Statement Report (NNDS) (EB39). Pages 6 to 29 of this report sets out when the actions will take place, by whom, what resources are needed and it identifies where the relevant agencies and partners have been involved in its preparation. The report also sets out the completed and ongoing work required to deliver the individual strategic housing sites. The Delivery Statement working in combination with the SA and IDP demonstrates that the new neighbourhoods and housing opportunity areas identified in the Core Strategy can be delivered in accordance with the Council’s planning policy framework and PPS12.

3.34 It is important to distinguish the infrastructure planning required to support the Core Strategy and that needed for a planning application. The Inspector will be aware that several of our developer partners are preparing to take outline planning applications forward, and have prepared more detailed technical information which gives a further degree of confidence in our ability to plan and deliver the early strategic sites. The Council is supportive of this approach in principle as it supports the case that sites can be delivered. However, we equally want to make it clear that this work and the level of infrastructure planning required for a planning application, is beyond that needed for the Core Strategy and compliance with the reasonable prospect test of PPS12.

3.35 With regard to strategic flood risk assessment, the Council, EA and our developer partners have been working collaboratively to reduce the remaining areas of difference to one issue. Officers have set out a response to the EA on this matter and a copy has been provided to the Inspector and placed in the Examination Library. At the time of preparing this statement the response from the EA is awaited. However, officers are confident that a clear and precise process is in train that will resolve any outstanding flooding issues.

3.36 With regard to strategic transport provision, the Highways Agency (HA) has indicated that it has no in principle concerns about the Core Strategy. The provisions for improvements to the strategic network are realistic and deliverable in the context of the expected housing trajectory. The HA has indicate that site specific highways provisions will be dealt with through the more detailed master planning stage.
3.37 Therefore whilst there are some infrastructure issues to be detailed before site delivery, this is only to be expected given the stage in the process reached so far. Where uncertainty and contingencies are identified, the NNDS has identified how these will be addressed. The Council considers it has provided sufficient information in the Core Strategy, SA, IDP and supporting evidence base to demonstrate there is a reasonable prospect of achieving delivery of strategic sites over the Plan period.

4. Green Belt (Agenda Item 5)

Q1 Should the CS delegate Green Belt (GB) boundary changes to subsequent DPDs as would happen with one of its proposed neighbourhoods and the possible identification of a contingency site?

Officer response: The Council’s position is that it is not the intention of the Core Strategy to delegate Green Belt changes to subsequent DPDs in respect of the East of Harry Stoke New Neighbourhood. However, it is appropriate for the Core Strategy to require this in respect of contingency land within the Green Belt.

East of Harry Stoke New Neighbourhood

4.1 The intention of the Core Strategy was in order to avoid a situation where if, for any reason the Stoke Gifford Transport Link (SGTL) did not come forward, then land currently designated as Green Belt was not prematurely removed from it, leaving it as white land. To a degree this reflected the uncertainty in late 2010/early 2011 around funding of this transport link, while respecting the value that South Gloucestershire’s communities place on protecting the Green Belt. There is now greater certainty that the link will be delivered.

4.2 To address this matter, officers consider that the Core Strategy should make it clear that the Green Belt boundary will be amended to remove the land identified for the East of Harry Stoke New Neighbourhood from the Green Belt. This would involve minor amendments to Policies CS5 and CS27, as well as consequential changes to the Strategy for Development in Chapters 1 and 4. This would overcome any unintentional policy inconsistencies while also enabling delivery of the strategic site and SGTL.

Land west of the A4018

4.3 It is considered reasonable and consistent, as per the Bristol City Core Strategy, to delegate alterations to the Green Belt to subsequent DPDs where it relates to land which would not be released for development unless a proven need for additional housing land is established at a later date. Officers consider that the wording set out in paragraph 4.14 of the Core Strategy is sufficiently clear in this regard and that the plan, monitor, manage approach set out in the Core Strategy and reported through the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) (EB5) is robust to ensure this contingency site can be introduced in a timely way, if necessary.
Q2 Doesn’t this approach undermine the effectiveness of the CS by calling into question whether proposals can be delivered, especially if supporting infrastructure is not forthcoming?

Response: No

4.4 Officers now have greater certainty that the Stoke Gifford Transport Link will be delivered either through DfT funding or through an alternative funding mechanism. If the Inspector was minded to amend the Green Belt Boundary now, in respect of land to accommodate the East of Harry Stoke New Neighbourhood, then this would not impact on the development strategy set out in the Core Strategy and would not fundamentally alter the plan. Officers do not consider that this amendment would prejudice anyone in respect of the consultation process, as the proposed East of Harry Stoke New Neighbourhood and the Stoke Gifford Transport Route have been included within the appropriate consultation stage of the Core Strategy.

Q3 Has an appraisal of GB land been carried out to identify and justify the changes to the GB, including the need for safeguarded land (PPG2, para. 2.12)?

Officer response: No

4.5 The Council has not conducted an appraisal of Green Belt land in order to identify and justify changes to the Green Belt. However, the Council published a Strategic Green Belt Assessment in September 2006 (EB36). This was conducted as part of our forward planning work and in order to respond to the draft RSS. The Strategic Green Belt Assessment stated that constraints to development and the results of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process would also need to be taken into account in order to determine the most sustainable and appropriate location and scale for new development. The Council followed this approach through the production of the Core Strategy, in order to deliver an effective spatial plan and appropriately protect the Green Belt.

4.6 It was not considered necessary to safeguard land between the urban area and the Green Belt, as envisaged by paragraph 2.12 of PPG2, due to the fact that the development strategy does not require it. The plan, monitor, manage approach set out in paragraphs 4.7 and 4.8 above, detail the mechanism for bringing forward the Green Belt contingency site on land west of the A4018, therefore safeguarding this site is not necessary.
5. **Filton Airfield** (Agenda Item 6)

Q1 Filton Airfield is a significant part of the North Fringe Area. Is it appropriate or sufficient to deal with the closure of Airfield as a separate component of the CS and devolve further consideration to a future DPD?

5.1 On 14 April 2011, BAe Systems announced its intention to close Filton Airfield in December 2012. This announcement came at a time when the Core Strategy was at an advanced stage and shortly to be subject to independent Examination. Notwithstanding this, the future of the Airfield site is a matter which the Council recognises the Core Strategy will need to take into account, and will be an issue for discussion at the Examination. PPS12 advises that, for a Core Strategy to be effective, it must be able to deal with changing circumstances and issues that arise over the time frame of the plan. It is not appropriate to leave such matters to a review.

5.2 The Council published the Filton Airfield Position Statement (SG4/2) and supporting Sustainability Appraisal (SG4/1) on 16th June for a six week public consultation period which will be completed by the end of July. The Position Statement confirms that the Council recognises the potential impact of the impending closure of the airfield. It also confirms that the Core Strategy is sufficiently flexible to respond to this changing situation and it sets out the proposed approach to take forward through the Core Strategy and how the plan could be amended. This will form the basis for the Council’s position at the forthcoming Examination.

5.3 The Position Statement makes it clear that the Core Strategy’s vision, spatial objectives and development strategy for the District and the communities of the Bristol North Fringe is sufficiently resilient and flexible to assimilate this change in circumstances. We therefore consider that with some additional, but not fundamental, adaptations to the Plan, the Airfield site can be recognised as a strategic opportunity, as well as providing greater overall flexibility in the Core Strategy’s approach to planning for growth.

5.4 However, it is also important to recognise that technical and community involvement work is at a very initial stage. It would therefore not be appropriate to view the delivery of the airfield as a strategic site in the same way as the new neighbourhoods and Thornbury as set out at policies CS26, CS27, CS31 and CS33. Neither would the Council want to unnecessarily delay progressing the Core Strategy and delivering development currently planned south of Filton airfield and at the Mall/ Patchway.

5.5 The suggested approach is therefore to strengthen the existing spatial strategy set out at Policy CS25 and to introduce a programme management style policy. These adaptations would recognise the Airfield in the Core Strategy as a development site to be integrated with the Cribbs/Patchway New Neighbourhoods. Development will not proceed until sufficient community consultation and technical assessment has confirmed the appropriate development option for the site. This is given expression in policy terms through the new Policy CS26A as set out in the Filton Airfield Position Statement Appendix 1 which sets out the following guiding principles:
• secure investment in and the long term future of the aerospace sector at Filton;
• provide local employment;
• achieve mixed and balanced communities;
• strengthen linkages with existing and new communities;
• reinforce and enhance community identities over the wider area;
• enhance role of Cribbs/ Patchway as a centre;
• secure home for Concorde;
• strengthen transportation and movement linkages;
• incorporate a well integrated Green Infrastructure network
• recognise different lead in times for delivery of development within the wider area;
• ensure community input to place making;
• cement working relationship with BAe Systems; and
• bring forward a detailed development framework in the Sites, Policies and Places DPD.

5.6 Officers have held initial discussions with BAe Systems, the owners of the Airfield, who are supportive of the proposed way forward. These discussions will continue through a series of ongoing discussions with BAe Systems and other interested parties, including developers and partners involved in planning the adjoining new neighbourhoods over the coming months. We also understand that a similar approach to dealing with a windfall airfield site was taken by Stockport Council in its Core Strategy which includes the Woodford Aerodrome site. This has a number of similarities to Filton Airfield. This Core Strategy was subject to an EIP in October 2010 and was adopted in March 2011.

5.7 In summary, therefore the Council considers that it has a robust and pragmatic approach to responding to the circumstances presented by the BAe Systems announcement. This identifies the future role and function of the airfield as a development opportunity for a mixed use development integrated with the Cribbs/Patchway New Neighbourhood; while recognising that the detail of future development of Filton Airfield needs to be carefully considered and subject to community consultation. The approach therefore gives certainty that the Core Strategy can respond to the circumstances that have unexpectedly arisen and sets out a strategic spatial approach for the future use and management of this site and gives a LDF plan led mechanism solution for taking this forward. This is within the context of the place making objectives of the Bristol North Fringe, while recognising that it would be inappropriate to delay existing strategic growth identified in the Core Strategy. This approach allows all parties to go forward with the EiP in September while meeting the requirements of PPS12 and PPS3.
6. Options open to the inspector (agenda item 7)

6.1 We understand that in essence there are two options open to the Inspector. First continue with the Core Strategy examination in either a single or dual way or recommend withdrawal of the Plan.

6.2 There are a number of challenging issues and potential risks that highlight the importance of making timely progress with the Core Strategy EiP. These can be summarised as:

- Ministerial Statement Planning for Growth and the significant weight that the Secretary of State will attach to this;
- The prospect of speculative planning applications coming forward where plans are absent, out of date, silent or indeterminate;
- Importance of bringing land forward for development, including demonstrating and maintaining a 5 year housing land supply which accords with the Council’s and our community’s objectives and ambitions for sustainable development and protecting the Green Belt; and
- Impending changes to the statutory planning system and national planning guidance during the enactment of the Localism Bill and introduction of the National Planning Framework, which could potentially delay the Core Strategy process while a new legislative framework is enacted.

6.3 We consider that re-submitting the Core Strategy would delay the plan by up to a year while a further Submission Plan is revised, Regulation 27 consultation undertaken and the Plan prepared for and re-submitted to the Secretary of State.

6.4 If this route was followed, our view is that the ability to use the Core Strategy would be greatly diminished, with reliance instead on an increasingly dated SGLP policy framework. It is also highly likely that both our developer partners who are already working collaboratively and constructively with the Council to support the delivery of the new neighbourhoods, as well as other speculative developers, would seek to progress planning applications in accordance with the Ministerial Statement and PPS3.

6.5 The consequences of this would be to the detriment of the Council’s determination to lead on a plan led approach to development, as well as to the disadvantage of our communities. There would be a very real risk that the housing requirement and spatial development strategy for South Gloucestershire would be established through planning by appeal rather than the plan led system. In short delaying now would not be in the interests of good planning.

South Gloucestershire Council, Spatial Planning Team
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Letter from Cllr Calway, Leader of South Gloucestershire Council
Mr P Crysell  
c/o Programme Officer  
South Gloucestershire Council

Date: 27 June 2011  
Your Ref:  
Our Ref: JC/lb  
Tel: (01454) 863019 (Secretary)  
Fax: (01454) 863139

Dear Mr Crysell,

In my capacity as Leader of the South Gloucestershire Council and Chair of South Gloucestershire Cabinet, I am writing to confirm that when Cabinet considered the Pre-Submission version of the Core Strategy in March 2010 it was mine and my Cabinet's understanding that the document we considered and approved for consultation was the Submission Core Strategy and supporting Sustainability Appraisal.

Resolution 1 of minute 151 of the March 2010 Cabinet, provided the necessary authority to publish the Pre-Submission Core Strategy for the purposes of Regulation 27 of the 2004 Regulations.

For all the reasons set out above I confirm that I endorse paragraph 1.23a of the Submission Core Strategy that the March 2010 document was the Submission Core Strategy.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

COUNCILLOR JOHN CALWAY
LEADER OF THE COUNCIL
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8th March 2010 Cabinet Report
8th March 2010 Minutes
13th December 2010 Cabinet Report
13th December Minutes
15th December Council Covering Report
15th December 2010 Minutes
South Gloucestershire Council

THE CABINET

PORTFOLIO: Executive Member for Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment

DATE OF MEETING: 8th March 2010

SUBJECT OF REPORT: SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE CORE STRATEGY: PRE-SUBMISSION DRAFT FOR CONSULTATION (ALL WARDS)

Purpose of Report

1 To approve the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy Pre-Submission publication draft document for public consultation. The Core Strategy Pre-Submission draft document is attached as Appendix 1 to this report.

Policy

2 The context for the Core Strategy is influenced by three main drivers; the Sustainable Community Strategy; the concerns, issues and priorities identified through the Council’s commitment to public engagement and consultation and thirdly the Council’s commitment to managing growth and ensuring that the level of future development is sustainable and appropriate to the needs of existing and future residents of South Gloucestershire.

3 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (the Act) introduced a new requirement for Local Authorities to produce Local Development Frameworks, which in time will replace existing Local Plans. The South Gloucestershire Core Strategy will be the key document in a portfolio of new statutory plans that will form part of the Council’s Local Development Framework. Collectively these will deliver the spatial planning strategy for South Gloucestershire.

4 The Core Strategy is the spatial planning document which sets out the vision for South Gloucestershire based on evidence, community objectives and a detailed spatial strategy for delivering future development in South Gloucestershire to 2026. This will be translated into policies and programmes that will identify the general location of new development, its type and scale, and the resources to deliver it, as well as protecting what is valued about the area.

Planning Context

5 The preparation of the Core Strategy has been undertaken in the context of the ongoing delay with finalising the South West Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), the Council’s strong objections to the high levels and distribution of housing development proposed by Government for the District and the need to ensure the
Council has a robust and up to date planning framework to manage and guide development in accordance with the Council’s commitment to sustainable development. Each of these issues, both individually and combined, has had a major impact on preparing the Core Strategy.

6 With regard to the RSS timetable, the Secretary of State intended to publish the final RSS in June 2009. However, this has been delayed following the judicial review of the East of England RSS, related to the failure to meet certain requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive. DCLG/GOSW have considered the implications of this review for the SWRSS and announced most recently by letter of 21st December, that a further appraisal of its proposals for the SWRSS would be undertaken, including testing reasonable alternatives to those Areas of Search for strategic housing, business or other development which were added or amended following consideration of the EiP Panel Report. This work has now been commissioned and consultants are expected to report by March 2010. No firm date has been given for the final publication of the new SWRSS and the Council does not now expect the final RSS to be published before the next general election.

7 Secondly, the Council, like many key stakeholders, remains fundamentally opposed to the high levels and distribution of housing growth proposed by the emerging RSS. The Council has therefore had to consider how to take forward its Core Strategy when there remains significant community objections to the RSS and the Government’s high and unsustainable housing requirements. Moreover, as there remains the very strong prospect that the RSS housing requirement and distribution may be altered, the Council has also had to weigh up the costs and resources involved in preparing the next stage of the Core Strategy.

8 Finally, the acute uncertainties relating the RSS as identified above have meant that the Council is faced with speculative planning applications from developers seeking to bring forward housing sites ahead of the RSS being confirmed. An up to date policy framework is required to deal with these planning applications, as well as help support sustainable housing sites the Council considers should be delivered. Moreover, a comprehensive approach to the phasing of development and infrastructure is required to help ensure that South Gloucestershire infrastructure delivery objectives are clear and the area plays its role in helping to deliver the longer term vision for the West of England.

9 In addressing the issues identified above, the Council has recognised it faces a clear dilemma. On the one hand, it is difficult to maintain progress on the Core Strategy, with the SWRSS not yet finalised and possibly subject to further changes. However, there is also significant pressure for development in the District and a need to update the planning policy framework, currently based on “saved” policies in the South Gloucestershire Local Plan and Joint Replacement Structure Plan.

10 In balancing these issues, the Council has considered that the best approach in these changing and challenging circumstances is to make progress by
developing a pre-submission Core Strategy which sets out with some certainty, our approach to managing growth in the short to medium term and a suite of planning policies which can be used for the management of development and in determining planning applications ahead of the RSS being finalised. The advantage of this approach is that the Pre-Submission draft Core Strategy could then be used as a material consideration and given weight in the consideration of planning applications as it progress through its remaining stages to adoption. The situation has been discussed with GOSW, which has agreed the principle of publishing the Core Strategy in February 2010, before the SWRSS has been finalised. This approach was confirmed by an Urgent PTSE Executive Decision in October 2009. As a result of this decision the Council has accelerated its Core Strategy production timetable to bring forward the Pre-Submission draft, the next formal statutory stage of the Core Strategy, from July 2010 to March.

The Issues

What is a Pre-Submission Draft Core Strategy document?

11 As a spatial plan, the Core Strategy will not just consider land use, but a comprehensive range of environmental, transport, economic and social issues as well. It will ‘join-up’ with plans and strategies of other organisations and agencies, as with those of South Gloucestershire Council, so that we are all working in the same direction. In particular, the Core Strategy will be closely integrated with the Sustainable Community Strategy and South Gloucestershire Council Plan. Under the new planning system, there are essentially three stages in a Development Plan Document’s preparation: Issues and Options, Pre-Submission Publication Draft and Submission. After submission, documents are subject to an Independent Examination into the ‘Soundness’ of the document. The Core Strategy has now reached the second production stage; Pre-Submission Publication Draft.

12 The Pre-Submission Draft has been prepared taking on board the feedback and responses received to the Issues and Options document. Published in April 2008, this was the first stage in the production of the Core Strategy. The role of this document was to set out ideas about the issues and challenges facing South Gloucestershire and propose ways that the Core Strategy could address them. This included work to develop visions for different areas of South Gloucestershire. It also provided the opportunity for others to bring forward development locations not included in this document so that they could be considered at an early stage in the preparation of the Core Strategy. The comments and suggestions received were all used to assist in the preparation of Pre-submission draft and form an important part of the evidence base to support the emerging Core Strategy.

13 To support the Core Strategy the Council also intends in the short term, to retain policies in the SGLP. This will ensure sufficient policies remain in place for development control purposes while officers complete the remaining parts of the Local Development Framework. A list of the retained SGLP policies is contained
as an appendix within the draft Core Strategy. However, it is recognised that the retained SGLP policies will need to be updated. To achieve this and complete the portfolio of documents to form the Council’s LDF, it is proposed to bring forward a Sites and Policies DPD. This Plan will provide additional development management policies to replace the SGLP and confirm the remaining non strategic site allocations required to support the Core Strategy’s vision, spatial objectives and development strategy. In addition a programme of SPD is planned. This will provide further guidance to develop the master planning, approach to design, affordable housing, green infrastructure and other policy areas where further more detailed clarification and technical explanation is needed to support policy implementation and delivery. This work programme will be set out when the Council amends its Local Development Scheme. This is the 3 year rolling project plan setting out the LDF documents South Gloucestershire intends to complete.

Emerging Core Strategy – structure and content

14 The document is divided into three parts:

15 The first part sets out the role and purpose of the Core Strategy this includes the spatial portrait of the District as at 2010, key issues and the development vision, along with spatial objectives and the Plan’s overall strategy for development.

16 The second part of the document builds on information above and sets out about 24 over arching policies to provide strategic alignment with the Sustainable Community Strategy, join up with other plans and programmes, and fulfill SGC’s high level objectives for tackling climate change and delivering sustainable communities. It also sets out, on a topic basis, policies for providing housing (including affordable housing) and community infrastructure, maintaining economic prosperity, tackling congestion and improving accessibility, and managing environmental resources and built heritage.

17 The final part of the document deals with issues facing each part of the District and sets out spatial policies to achieve priorities such as mixed and balanced communities, economic development, job creation and transport investment. Core Strategies are required to be spatial in nature and to set out a strategy to deliver the Plan’s overall vision and key objectives. This area based approach contains the ‘place making’ polices that will effectively guide future investment and other plans, policies and programmes to achieve strong and prosperous sustainable communities in each of the 6 spatial areas of the District. The 6 spatial areas are:

1) The Bristol North Fringe
2) The Bristol East Fringe
3) Yate/Chipping Sodbury
4) Thornbury
Strategy for development – the Spatial Strategy

18 The Core Strategy sets out the new development that can be provided over the next 15 years and sets out potential development areas that could come forward to support mixed and balanced communities. The rationale supporting this strategy focuses on planning with some certainty for development in the first five years of the Plan period, with the necessary infrastructure in place or programmed. Where there are major infrastructure constraints, such as at the Yate and West of the M32 areas, development opportunities are phased to coincide with the detailed planning and provision of the essential infrastructure needed to support this growth. If the infrastructure is not delivered as planned then the Council would need to review their continued inclusion in the Core Strategy. Where major issues remain unresolved pending the outcome of the RSS or alternative regional/sub-regional arrangements, the Strategy confirms that the adopted Local Plan policy position will remain unchanged until at least 2026. This is a pragmatic and positive approach that can be put in place relatively quickly to provide an updated policy context to deal with the challenge of climate change, the expected market recovery, manage development in accordance with the requirements of PPS3, and ensure new growth is phased with the delivery of the necessary infrastructure required to support sustainable communities.

19 The Plan’s development strategy concentrates new development within the Bristol North Fringe/East Fringe Urban Areas, in places where essential infrastructure is in place or planned. This will reduce the need to travel and commute, accompanied by a package of public transport measures and supported by other community infrastructure. Development in the North Fringe of Bristol is focused at two key areas. At Patchway/Cribbs Causeway land is allocated for 2,200 dwellings/14ha of employment land at Charlton Hayes (Northfield). Further strategic provision is also made for a new neighborhood of up to 1,750 homes, local services and facilities at Cribbs Causeway and south of Filton Airfield. The second key area is West of the M32/ Harry Stoke where in the first 5 years of the Plan a major element of the 2,600 dwellings planned to be delivered at three key sites Wallscourt Farm, Harry Stoke and land East of Coldharbour Lane will be completed. Subject to the delivery of a new transport link serving Stoke Gifford a new neighbourhood of up to 2,000 homes is also planned in this area to come forward after 2016. In the East Fringe of Bristol, by 2020, a major mixed-use development on 177ha of land at Emersons Green East comprising 2,750 dwellings, a Science park and 19ha of employment, is identified.

20 Outside the Bristol urban area, development land will be provided in Yate/Chipping Sodbury and Thornbury, to promote greater self-containment of these settlements. Within villages, the focus will be on supporting existing services and limiting new housing. At Yate and Chipping Sodbury, up to 2016, their separate but inter-related role will be developed, achieving greater self-containment and strengthening the vitality of the towns as service centres, including major investment in Yate town centre, and a new foodstore in Chipping Sodbury. Subject to a new sewer connection being provided to deal with existing and potential future flooding problems, a new neighbourhood of 3,000 new homes at North Yate is envisaged. Limited development is also planned at Thornbury, and
employment development at Severnside will be supported, subject to ecological/biodiversity issues.

21 In promoting this development strategy the Council has sought to limit the impact of new housing development on the Green Belt. The Council remains in principle opposed to the RSS significantly reducing the Green Belt to accommodate land for housing growth. However, the Council does recognise that new primary transport infrastructure is needed to support the Council’s wider objectives and initiatives. For this reason land to the West of the M32 which is currently Green Belt, is identified for the provision of a major Rapid Transit link comprising a new public transport and road connection between Bradley Stoke and the Ring Road. In the event that this transport link goes ahead the role and function of the Green Belt would be significantly compromised in this area. This it is considered supports the case to justify the exceptional circumstances to release the land from the Green Belt to deliver a new neighbourhood to form an extension to the planned Harry Stoke development.

22 To support the development strategy a key diagram helps to convey the major messages simply. This shows the major areas of new development and investment planned, as well the key constraints and principle environmental assets of the District. The Key Diagram is contained within the Core Strategy at Appendix 1 of this report.

Scale and distribution of housing

23 The delivery of the development strategy described thus far will make provision for 21,500 new homes in the period 2006-2026. But of this total some 2,600 dwellings have been completed between 2006/7-2008/9. The Plan therefore makes provision for an additional 18,900 new homes at an average rate of 1,111 dwellings each year, between 2009/10 and 2025/26 based on the locational strategy set out above. As at December 2009, over half of this housing, 12,220 dwellings is accounted for through allocations in the South Gloucestershire Local Plan (7,500 dwellings) and other sites in the North and East Fringes of the Bristol urban area and the rest of South Gloucestershire which have planning permissions, specific, unallocated brownfield sites that have the potential to make a significant contribution to housing delivery during the first 5 year period of the Core Strategy, and assumptions for unidentified windfall sites expected to come forward post 2022.

24 To supplement these allocations and commitments, the Core Strategy identifies, subject to the necessary infrastructure being confirmed and commenced, 3 new neighbourhoods at Cribbs/Patchway, (1,750), East of Harry Stoke (2,000) and North Yate (3,000). In total these strategic locations will deliver 6,150 dwellings by 2026. To meet the development and housing needs of their own communities smaller development opportunities at Thornbury (500 dwellings) and Chipping Sodbury (175 dwellings) will provide a further 675 dwellings.

25 The current economic downturn in the economy and the continuing delays and uncertainty over the RSS will continue to have an impact on housing delivery for the next year or so. To support the economic recovery the Council is confident that the level of existing commitments and the ongoing partnership
working on planning for the new neighborhoods, will mean that there is a rolling and deliverable supply of housing available in the short to medium term to deliver mixed and sustainable communities in accordance with the requirements of PPS3.

Consultation

26 Issues surrounding the preparation of the Core Strategy Document have been considered extensively at Development Plan Document Policy Advisory Group (DPD PAG) meetings. This is a group of senior officers and members which meet on a regular basis to consider regional, sub-regional and local planning matters. Final comments, which have been incorporated into the draft Core Strategy, were received from DPD PAG on 23rd February 2010. In addition the findings of the 2009 PTSE Select Review of developing the planning process to promote sustainable communities and support healthy lifestyles have been fully taken into consideration in drafting the Core Strategy. A Report setting out the way the PTSE Select Review findings have been taken forward into the Core Strategy was considered at the recent PTSE Select Committee meeting on 20th January.

27 As part of the pre-production work on this document, at the request of the communities involved, officers undertook a series of community engagement and visioning events in Yate/ Sodbury, Bristol North Fringe and Thornbury. These events were carried out to test and develop the Plan’s emerging Development Strategy in locations where the Council considered it important and necessary to understand community views and ideas about the potential impact of additional growth. To progress this work the Council has worked closely with community representatives who have provided a framework to consider and discuss the options and choices for managing the pressure for future growth and housing development. These events, organised by community representatives, facilitated by officers and involving major land landowners and developers, have provided very valuable information to inform the preparation of the Core Strategy. This approach fully complies with practices and procedures set out in the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) which recognises and promotes early engagement to foster a shared understanding and vision for how communities can respond to the pressure and challenges of future development.

28 In addition officers have discussed and tested emerging Core Strategy policies with a range of key stakeholders both within the Council and supporting partners and agencies. The purpose of this has been to seek views about the purpose and wording of individual policies. This approach is consistent with plan making regulations set out in PPS12 which advises local authorities to engage key stakeholders in timely and effective discussions. The Core Strategy has also been subject to an LDF Advisory Visit conducted by a planning inspector appointed by PINS. The feedback received following this PINS Advisory Visit has been taken on board in finalising the Core Strategy.

29 Public consultation is planned to start as soon as practically possible
following the approval of the Core Strategy by Cabinet.

Consideration by Select Committee

30 The PTSE Select Committee and the Joint Development Control East and West Committee considered this document on 3rd March 2010. Due to the timing of the meeting, the comments of joint PTSE Select and DC East and West meeting will be reported as a supplementary written update to this report.

Finance Implications

31 The Council Plan 2008-2011 identifies the pressures of housing growth as a key challenge. Managing future development is identified as one of the Council’s 7 corporate aims and one of three priority areas where a special focus will be placed on achieving excellence in the medium term. The Council has made the necessary financial provision to cover work so far, and the future Core Strategy examination.

Human Resource Implication

32 As the Council Plan makes clear, achieving excellence and striving for continuous improvement will require the commitment and endeavour of all staff. The Council has recognised that to respond successfully to the identified priority of managing future development will mean investing in the staff resources and training and development needed to prepare and deliver the Core Strategy and other related plans and programmes. The Planning and Environment Service, which is leading on preparing the Core Strategy has prioritised establishing the staff resources needed to deliver the Core Strategy. Provided these resources are maintained, the Council will be able to meet its LDF milestone targets.

Legal Implications

33 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 introduced a mandatory requirement on authorities to produce a Local Development Framework. The Core Strategy is seen an essential part of the LDF portfolio of documents as it provides the overall vision, spatial planning objectives and strategic policy framework to guide and manage growth and change over the next 20 years. As set out in the Risks section below, the failure to produce a Core Strategy could greatly reduce the ability to manage and regulate the impact of the expected high levels of growth coming through the RSS process. The Council’s failure to demonstrate a 5 year land supply of deliverable sites and overall up to 15 years of developable sites as set in PPS3, based on the levels of growth in the emerging RSS, would be used by developers to justify speculative planning applications.

34 By publishing the Core Strategy, the Council is putting forward what it considers to be the development vision, spatial strategy and housing provision for the District up to 2026. Given the timetable for the production of the RSS remains very unclear, the Pre-submission publication draft represents a material
consideration in exercising the Council’s development management functions. Therefore although the weight and status of the Core Strategy will be less than a fully adopted plan, progressing the Core Strategy will send a clear signal to developers looking to challenge the Council on key sites that South Gloucestershire Council is responding to the RSS growth agenda through its Core Strategy. Failure to do this could lead to the prospect of significant numbers of planning appeals, with developers exploiting a policy vacuum in the context of the new emerging RSS. Progressing this key stage of the Core Strategy demonstrates a strong commitment to working towards adopting the Core Strategy.

35 Advancing the progression of the Core Strategy in accordance with the published Local Development Scheme timetable will also ensure that the Council meets LDF performance commitments agreed with Government and avoids the prospect of any punitive actions following the Direction from the Secretary of State in August 2006. Not progressing the Core Strategy would reduce the ability to bring forward other supporting Development Plan Documents, such as a Sites Allocation DPD, as the higher level policy framework established by the Core Strategy would be missing.

**Sustainability Implications**

36 The Council has produced and consulted on a generic Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report for the Local Development Framework, which outlines the sustainability framework that is used to assess Local Development Documents. The Scoping Report was approved on 25 March 2008 and an initial Sustainability Report was published to support the Issues and Options Document in May 2008. Sustainability appraisal is required to be undertaken at each key stage in the formulation of the Core Strategy. To comply with the procedures of the LDF system a Sustainability Appraisal Report is being produced to accompany the Core Strategy Pre-submission draft. This report will appraise the Plan including assessment of alternative and selected options. A copy of the SA is contained at Appendix 2.

**Equalities and Racial Impact Assessment**

37 The South Gloucestershire Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report confirms the Council’s commitment to equalities, and outlines how an Equalities Impact Assessment for all emerging documents in the Local Development Framework will be undertaken. The Sustainability Appraisal supporting the Pre-submission report consequently contains this assessment. The assessment does not identify any proposals which are likely to have an impact (either positive or negative) on any specific sections of the community - i.e. any impacts (positive or negative) are likely to impact on everyone within the community to a similar degree. Moreover, in undertaking public consultation and engagement, the principles of the Statement of Community Involvement will be followed. In this
way, it is intended that all sections of the community will be provided with the opportunity to become involved in the preparation of the Core Strategy.

**Risks, Mitigations and Opportunities**

38 The main risk to be addressed is whether the Council’s key objective to protect the District from inappropriate and unsustainable development can best be taken forward by progressing the Core Strategy while the RSS is not yet finalised. In assessing the risks involved the Council has considered on balance that its objective to manage the impact of future growth can best be achieved by making progress with the Core Strategy. By progressing the Core Strategy the Council is able to use the document as a key material consideration to challenge developers who claim the RSS is of considerable material weight and status, while ensuring compliance with PPS3. Not publishing the Core Strategy at this time and relying solely on the SGLP as the Council’s defence against speculative planning applications is considered a weaker option less likely to succeed.

39 In addition, other risks in taking forward the Core Strategy relate to the need to ensure that the Council produces the Core Strategy in line with regulations and correct procedures. Including superfluous information within the Plan and/or not covering all the necessary policies and proposals required for a Core Strategy could put it at risk of being found unsound at Examination. Moreover, failure to adhere to the work programme of milestone dates set out in the Local Development Scheme could result in additional large scale speculative planning applications being submitted by developers in advance of the Core Strategy being fully prepared. Officers consider that the preparation and production of the Core Strategy adequately complies with guidance in PPS12. However, should issues be raised subsequently, particularly regarding the technical evidence base and level of public consultation undertaken, the Council would have a further opportunity to review and amend the Plan, before progressing to the formal Submission stage.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

That Cabinet resolves:

1) The South Gloucestershire Core Strategy Pre-Submission Publication Draft, attached at Appendix 1 and the supporting Sustainability Appraisal at Appendix 2, is approved for public consultation.

2) That the Core Strategy Pre-Submission Publication Draft is a key material consideration for the purposes of exercising the Council’s development management functions.

3) To inform all town and parish councils, local MPs and stakeholders of the Plan’s availability and arrangements for public consultation as soon as practically possible following the Cabinet decision.

4) That delegated authority be given to the Director of Planning, Transportation
and Strategic Environment, in consultation with the Executive Member, to produce a public consultation strategy that ensures all interested parties, individuals and organisations the opportunity to be fully involved in the Core Strategy preparation and production process.

5 That delegated authority be given to the Director of Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment in consultation with the Executive Member for Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment to:

   a). Make any necessary minor drafting amendments to the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy Pre-Submission Publication Draft.

   b). Make any necessary changes of a minor factual and editing nature to complete the Sustainability Appraisal Report to support the Core Strategy Pre-Submission Publication Draft.

   c). Approve and publish the necessary supporting evidence base / technical studies, including the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, to support the Core Strategy Pre-Submission Publication Draft.

   d). Prepare, approve and publish a non-technical Core Strategy Pre-Submission Publication Draft leaflet for use during the consultation period.

6 That the saved SGLP policies contained at Appendix 2 of the Core Strategy are retained and used alongside the remaining saved SGLP policies proposed to be retained, for the purposes of development control decision making until replaced by appropriate LDF documents.

7. That a letter is sent to the Secretary of State and GOSW explaining that South Gloucestershire Council considers the Core Strategy Pre-Submission Publication Draft establishes the development vision, spatial strategy and housing provision for the District up to 2026.

Author
Peter Jackson, Director of Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment

Departmental Contact(s)
Barbara Maksymiw, Head of Planning and Environment (PTSE)
Telephone 01454 3444
Email: Barbara.maksymiw@southglos.gov.uk
Patrick Conroy, Spatial Planning Team Leader (PTSE)
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Email: Patrick.conroy@southglos.gov.uk
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Cabinet

Monday, 8th March, 2010

Present

Councillors: Brian Allinson, John Calway, Sheila Cook, Heather Goddard, John Godwin, Allan Higgs and Matthew Riddle

In Attendance

Councillors: R Hutchinson, P Hockey, R Davis, S Holloway, M Tyrell, J Goddard, S Hope, S Grant, P Tyzack.

143 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS (Agenda Item 1)

144 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 2)

None.

145 EVACUATION PROCEDURE (Agenda Item 3)

The Chair drew attention to the emergency evacuation procedure as set out on the agenda.

Brian Allinson: Stoke Gifford Parish Council
John Calway: Oldland Parish Council
Sheila Cook: Almondsbury Parish Council
Heather Goddard: Hanham Parish Council and Hanham Abbots Parish Council
John Godwin: Winterbourne Parish Council
Allan Higgs: Winterbourne Parish Council

146 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 (Agenda Item 4)

Councillor M Riddle declared 2 personal interests in item 8 for the following reasons:
He was a resident in Oldbury Lane, Thornbury which is referred to in Chapter 15.

He rents farmland to a farmer who also farms the land at Park Farm, which was the proposed site for development adjacent to Castle School.

147 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS AS SCHOOL GOVERNORS (Agenda Item 5)

Sheila Cook Almondsbury Primary School and member of the management committee of the Pupil Referral Unit.

Heather Goddard Hanham Abbots Junior School

John Godwin John Cabot Academy (LEA Appointee)

148 ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC (Agenda Item 6)

Mr Peter Barker, Chairman of Latteridge/Church Road Campaign Group “NoMorre” raised an issue on behalf of residents and users of the B4059 Church/Latteridge Road concerning the increasing scale of danger, noise, pollution, vibration and subsequent damage from the inordinate number and size of HGVs using the road. The Road Campaign Group sought the Cabinet’s support on the matter. The Chair agreed that the Executive Member for Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment would look into the matter and respond accordingly.

149 ITEMS FROM MEMBERS (Agenda Item 7)

In responding to a question from Councillor P Hockey the Chief Executive indicated that tours of the new Office Building as Yate would be provided for members of the public. Information on tours would be published in due course on the corporate website.

150 ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIR DECIDES ARE URGENT (Agenda Item 8)

None.

151 THE SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE CORE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT (Agenda Item 9)

The Cabinet considered a report on the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy Pre-Submission publication draft document for public consultation.

The following additional documents were circulated at the meeting:
• Comments on the Draft Core Strategy following the joint meeting of 3 March 2010 PT&SE Select, Development Control (East), and (West) Committees (together with officer comments)

• Labour Group response to the Draft Core Strategy (together with officer comments)

• Revised Recommendations

• Draft Engagement/Consultation Programme for the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy Pre-Submission Draft for Public Consultation

The Director of Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment introduced the report and explained the purpose of the pre-submission draft Core Strategy Document.

The Chairman then allowed opportunity for Members of the public to comment on the draft Core Strategy.

The Executive Member for Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment outlined the key issues addressed by the draft Core Strategy.

Patrick Conroy then took members through the Core Strategy document chapter by chapter. At the appropriate points he referred to the comments received from the Joint meeting of the PT&SE, Development Control (East) and West Committees and also the Labour Group comments.

Members of the Cabinet, after each of the comments proposed within the documents, indicated whether or not they accepted the proposals put forward.

In respect of the joint meeting of the PT&SE, Development Control (East) and West Committees the Cabinet accepted all the comments with the exception of the following which were not accepted and where the wording in the draft Core Strategy accompanying the Cabinet report would remain unchanged:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Para</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 (38)</td>
<td>Chapter 5 (and contents page)</td>
<td>After chapter title: Responding to Climate Change through High Quality Design</td>
<td>To improve clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 (109)</td>
<td>Policy CS19 and para 10.44</td>
<td>Is reference to Parish Council Support required?</td>
<td>To improve implementation of policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In respect of the Labour Group submission the Cabinet accepted all the comments proposed.
Members of the Cabinet also proposed their own amendments at various points within the document as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Proposed by</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 Para 1.5</td>
<td>M Riddle</td>
<td>Remove “although of limited weight at this stage”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Para 3.13</td>
<td>M Riddle</td>
<td>Remove “steadily in the second line.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Second para of Policy</td>
<td>M Riddle</td>
<td>Add “South west region and “ after “in the” in the second line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Para 4.16</td>
<td>M Riddle</td>
<td>Add “to achieve its academic vision” after “its campus” in line four.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 Second Box</td>
<td>J Godwin</td>
<td>Add “to provide more high quality jobs” after “employment uses” in fifth line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139 Vision – first para</td>
<td>J Godwin</td>
<td>Add South west region and“ after “in the” in the second line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158 Figure 6</td>
<td>J Godwin</td>
<td>Add “Webbs Heath Pit” and identify with a heritage asset symbol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152 Key Diagram and Figure 6</td>
<td>J Godwin</td>
<td>Ensure the two maps are consistent in relation to the area of land south of the ring road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New pas 18.33</td>
<td>M Riddle</td>
<td>Add new para after para18.32 “The view of the Council is that community benefits should be achieved for such major infrastructure projects, as set out in paragraph 18.24 above. Any community benefits should also be subject to public consultation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These proposals were accepted by Cabinet.

Members of the Cabinet and other Councillors in attendance took the opportunity to place on record their appreciation of the cross party working of the PAG members, the PTSE Select Committee and Development Control Committees and also Officers who had all put in extra effort into such a valuable document.

Resolved:

1) That the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy Pre-Submission Publication Draft, attached at Appendix 1 and the supporting Sustainability Appraisal at Appendix 2, be approved for public consultation.
2) To commence public consultation on the Pre-Submission publication Draft Core Strategy and to make the document available in public libraries, One Stop shops and to the Town and parish Councils, stakeholders, MPs and on the public website as soon as practicably possible after the Cabinet decision. The consultation period will run until July 2010 and will reflect the constraints associated with the impending general election, with pro-active community engagement events being programmed to take place after the election.

3) That the Core Strategy Pre-Submission Publication Draft is a key material consideration for the purposes of exercising the Council’s development management functions.

4) To inform all town and parish councils, local MPs and stakeholders of the Plan’s availability and arrangements for public consultation as soon as practically possible following the Cabinet decision.

5) That delegated authority be given to the Director of Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment, in consultation with the Executive Member, to produce a public consultation strategy that ensures all interested parties, individuals and organisations the opportunity to be fully involved in the Core Strategy preparation and production process.

6) That delegated authority be given to the Director of Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment in consultation with the Executive Member for Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment to:

   a). Make any necessary minor drafting amendments to the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy Pre-Submission Publication Draft.

   b). Make any necessary changes of a minor factual and editing nature to complete the Sustainability Appraisal Report to support the Core Strategy Pre-Submission Publication Draft.

   c). Approve and publish the necessary supporting evidence base / technical studies, including the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, to support the Core Strategy Pre-Submission Publication Draft.

   d). Prepare, approve and publish a non-technical Core Strategy Pre Submission Publication Draft leaflet for use during the consultation period.

7) That the saved SGLP policies contained at Appendix 2 of the Core Strategy are retained and used alongside the remaining saved SGLP policies proposed to be retained, for the purposes of development control decision making until replaced by appropriate LDF documents.
8) That a letter is sent to the Secretary of State and GOSW explaining that South Gloucestershire Council considers the Core Strategy Pre-Submission Publication Draft establishes the development vision, spatial strategy and housing provision for the District up to 2026.

9) That, should the Stoke Gifford Transport Link and mixed use development identified in the draft policy CS27 be delivered, a further review of the Green Belt be undertaken to examine the scope to extend green belt designation to other areas to compensate for any potential loss of Green Belt.

10) That Cabinet expresses its thanks to the community groups who have actively engaged in and helped shape the preparation of the Core Strategy, Particularly those at Yate/Chipping Sodbury and Thornbury.

Reasons for the Decision

Under the current planning system, there are a number of stages in a Development Plan Document’s preparation, of which the Pre-Submission Publication Draft is one. After submission, documents are subject to an Independent Examination into the ‘Soundness’ of the document. The Core Strategy has now reached the second production stage; Pre-Submission Publication Draft.

Meeting closed 3.45 pm

Chair
South Gloucestershire Council

THE CABINET

PORTFOLIO: Executive Member for Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment

DATE OF MEETING: 13th December 2010

SUBJECT OF REPORT: SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE CORE STRATEGY: SUBMISSION TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE (ALL WARDS)

Purpose of Report

1. To recommend to Council the formal submission of the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy to the Secretary of State for independent examination.

Policy

2. The Core Strategy is a high level spatial planning document which sets out the development vision for South Gloucestershire and a detailed spatial strategy for delivering future development in the District to 2026 based on community objectives. The strategy is expressed in a series of policies and programmes which identify the general location of new development, its type and scale, and the resources to deliver it, as well as protecting what is valued about the area. The Core Strategy is closely integrated with the Sustainable Community Strategy and the Council Plan to ensure that the statutory planning system contributes to delivering the aims and priorities of the Council and our partners at both the local community and strategic planning levels.

3. Following the General Election on 27th May the Secretary of State wrote to Local Planning Authorities and to the Planning Inspectorate informing them of the Government’s intention to abolish Regional Strategies in the Localism Bill and that he expected them to have regard to this as a material consideration in planning decisions. Although a recent High Court judgment has delayed this formally taking place until the Localism Bill is enacted as primary legislation during 2011. The Government has clearly stated its intention to dismantle the regional planning system. Further reforms of the planning system are expected over the coming year. However, the Government has indicated that local authorities should continue to prepare local spatial plans for their areas comprising core strategies and other development plan documents.
In time the Core Strategy will replace the South Gloucestershire Local Plan. However, in the short term, the saved SGLP policies will be retained to ensure sufficient policies remain in place for development control purposes. A list of the retained SGLP policies is contained as an appendix within the draft Core Strategy.

**Background – Progress with completing the Core Strategy**

5. There are essentially three stages in a Development Plan Document’s preparation: Issues and Options, Pre-Submission and Submission. After submission, documents are subject to an Independent Examination into the ‘Soundness’ of the document. The Core Strategy has now reached the third production stage – Submission.

6. Work on the Core Strategy commenced in 2007 with stakeholders and organisations asked to identify the key issues facing South Gloucestershire. Based on the feedback and views received, the Council published its Issues and Options document. This document set out ideas about the issues and challenges facing South Gloucestershire and proposed ways that the Core Strategy could address them. This also included work to develop ‘visions’ for different areas of South Gloucestershire. Public consultation ran from May to July 2008. At this time the preparation of the Core Strategy was considerably influenced by the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy. Through the Issues and Options Consultation South Gloucestershire maintained its strong objection to the level and distribution of housing growth proposed by the RSS and it was made very clear in the Core Strategy that this high level of growth would have major impacts on the quality of life of our existing and future communities.

7. The feedback and responses received to the Issues and Options document, as well as the Council’s ongoing concerns and objections to the RSS, were used to inform the Pre-Submission document. The Council also worked closely with local community representatives to consider and discuss the options and choices for managing the pressure for future growth and housing development. To support and inform this work a series of events were held in areas where community representatives thought the impact of future development should be considered and reviewed. These community events were planned and organised with local community representatives and facilitated by officers. This provided very valuable information to inform the preparation of the Core Strategy. In addition the emerging Core Strategy policies were discussed with a range of key stakeholders both within the Council and supporting partners and agencies.

8. South Gloucestershire Cabinet formally considered the Pre-Submission Core Strategy at its meeting on 8th March 2010. Consultation on the Pre-Submission Core Strategy ran from March to August this year. In preparing the Plan the Council maintained its strong objection to the levels of growth proposed by the RSS which by this time had been significantly delayed by the prospect of legal challenge. In light of these circumstances and the importance attached to
maintaining progress with the Core Strategy, the Council considered the best approach in these changing and challenging circumstances was to make progress by developing a pre-submission Core Strategy which set out with some certainty, our approach to managing growth in the short to medium term and a suite of planning policies to be used for the management of development and in determining planning applications.

**Representations to the Pre-Submission Core Strategy and responding to the comments made.**

9. Around 2,200 responses have been received to the Pre-Submission document from around 900 respondents between March and August this year. However, unlike the procedure for preparing local plans, there is no longer a requirement for the local authority to summarise and respond to each individual representation. This is because the Inspector is examining the soundness of the Core Strategy. This is done by considering the issues that have been raised by representations made to the Pre-Submission document, rather than the detail of individual representations themselves.

10. As result, officers in reviewing comments have sought to identify the key issues raised to each section of the Core Strategy. This information is presented in Appendix 1 attached to this report which sets out the main issues raised and the proposed response. Based on this analysis, officers have considered whether further changes should be made to the Core Strategy. Where changes to the Core Strategy are considered appropriate these are set out in Appendix 2. All proposed amendments are highlighted at Appendix 3 which provides an updated version of the Core Strategy. Appendix 4 sets out the Sustainability Appraisal Report which accompanies the Core Strategy.

11. Officers are also preparing various pieces of technical work which will be required to support the case at the public examination.

**Consultation**

12. Public consultation on the Core Strategy ran from 8th March to 6th August. All respondents who made comments were acknowledged and a further letter setting out next steps and providing an opportunity to view all the representations made on-line was sent on 3rd November. The main issues raised have been considered by PAG and the PAG sub-group. Appendix 1 and 2 identify the key issues raised by representations, the officer response, as well as proposed changes considered necessary to update and clarify various aspects of the Pre-Submission document. These schedules, together with a marked up version of the Pre-Submission document with the changes inserted, are set out in Appendices to this report.

**Consideration by Select Committee**

13. The PTSE Select Committee and the Development Control East and
West Committee considered this document at a joint meeting on 8\textsuperscript{th} December. Due to the timing of the meeting, the comments of joint PTSE Select and DC East and West meeting will be reported as a supplementary written update to this report.

**Next Steps**

14. The Submission stage is where the draft Core Strategy is submitted to the Secretary of State. The Sustainability Appraisal, the evidence base documents, and the various statements which set out details of all the consultation and engagement that has taken place since work on the Core Strategy started in early 2007, are also submitted. However, prior to this taking place, changes put forward to the Core Strategy will be publicised in order for any party to see the changes made ahead of the Examination commencing. A six week period of publicity is planned, to commence as soon as practically possible. This is not a formal consultation stage and given the advanced stage the Core Strategy has reached, it simply provides an opportunity for the Council to make all parties aware that proposed changes have been made to the Core Strategy. Comments should therefore be limited to only those matters that the Council is proposing to change. Should the Council receive any comments, these will not be formally responded to. Instead they will be submitted along with other information and will be matters for the appointed inspector to take into consideration.

15. Following submission of the Core Strategy, the Plan will be subject to an Examination in Public (EiP). This is expected to take place in second half of 2011. Following the Examination the Inspector appointed to undertake an examination will produce a report which sets out his/ her findings on the soundness of the Core Strategy, together with any changes required to the document. Providing that the Core Strategy has been found sound, the Council, based on current procedures, must make the required changes to the Core Strategy before it can be adopted. This is expected to be completed and the Plan adopted by late 2011 or early 2012.

**Finance Implications**

16. The Council Plan 2008-2011 identifies the pressures of housing growth as a key challenge. Managing future development is identified as one of the Council’s 7 corporate aims and one of three priority areas where a special focus will be placed on achieving excellence in the medium term. The Council has made the necessary financial provision to cover work so far, and the future Core Strategy examination. However, it is important to recognise that any new developments which increase population will bring potential liabilities for new services and infrastructure. These all need to be considered when individual new developments are brought forward.

**Human Resource Implications**

17. As the Council Plan makes clear, achieving excellence and striving for continuous improvement will require the commitment and endeavour of all staff.
The Council has recognised that to respond successfully to the identified priority of managing future development will mean investing in the staff resources and training and development needed to prepare and deliver the Core Strategy and other related plans and programmes. The Planning and Environment Service, which is leading on preparing the Core Strategy has prioritised establishing the staff resources needed to deliver the Core Strategy.

Legal Implications

18. The Core Strategy is seen an essential part of the Council’s policy and strategy framework for delivering sustainable communities and managing the pressure for future development. As set out in the Risks section below, the failure to produce a Core Strategy could greatly reduce the ability to manage the pressure for future development as the Council would not have an up to date planning policy framework. This could also reduce the Council’s ability to demonstrate a 5 year land supply of deliverable sites and overall up to 15 years of developable sites as currently set in PPS3, and would therefore make many parts of the District potentially more vulnerable to speculative planning applications and increase the likelihood of adverse appeal decisions.

19. By preparing the Submission Core Strategy, the Council is putting forward what it considers to be the development vision, spatial strategy and housing provision for the District up to 2026. It is also ensuring it has an up to date policy framework to assess planning applications and support the Council's objective for sustainable development. Failure to do this could lead to increased pressure of speculative development with the prospect of significant increase in the number of planning appeals, with developers exploiting a policy vacuum in the context of an increasingly out of date Local Plan. Not progressing the Core Strategy would also reduce the ability to bring forward other supporting Development Plan Documents, such as a Sites and Policies DPD and SPD, as the higher level policy framework established by the Core Strategy would be missing.

Sustainability Implications

20. The Council has produced and consulted on a generic Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report for the Local Development Framework, which outlines the sustainability framework that is used to assess Local Development Documents. The Scoping Report was approved on 25 March 2008 and an initial Sustainability Report was published to support the Issues and Options Document in May 2008. Sustainability appraisal is required to be undertaken at each key stage in the formulation of the Core Strategy. To comply with the procedures of the LDF system the Sustainability Appraisal Report to support the Core Strategy Pre-Submission draft has been updated particularly in relation in Thornbury. This report appraises the Plan including assessment of alternative and selected options. A copy of the Sustainability Report is contained at Appendix 4.
Equalities and Racial Impact Assessment

23. The South Gloucestershire Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report confirms the Council’s commitment to equalities, and outlines how an Equalities Impact Assessment for all emerging documents in the Local Development Framework will be undertaken. The Sustainability Appraisal supporting the Submission report consequently contains this assessment. The findings of the assessment conclude that overall the Core Strategy policy framework will support the Council’s commitment to equalities and good race relations. Moreover, in undertaking public consultation and engagement, the principles of the Statement of Community Involvement will be followed. In this way, it is intended that all sections of the community have and will continue to be provided with the opportunity to be involved in the progressing the Core Strategy.

Risks, Mitigations and Opportunities

24. Not progressing this stage of the Core Strategy risks the very likely prospect of speculative planning applications being submitted in many parts of the District as developers would seek to exploit the lack of an up to date policy framework work.

25. Making significant changes to the pre submission Core Strategy that affect the substance of the document will also lead to the same effect as it would introduce significant delay to its preparation and reduce the weight and status of the Plan as a material consideration.

26. In assessing the risks involved, the Council has considered on balance that its objective to manage the impact of future growth and ensure it has the most up to date planning policy framework to respond to the pressure for development and comply with the requirement to ensure sufficient land is available to meet its five year land supply requirements, as well as the longer term need to ensure sufficient developable sites are available can best be achieved by making progress with the Core Strategy in its present form and content. This approach also sits well within the context of the Government’s new locally driven growth strategy and planned reforms to the planning system.

27. In addition, other risks in taking forward the Core Strategy relate to the need to ensure that the Council produces the Core Strategy in line with regulations and correct procedures. Including superfluous information within the Plan and/or not covering all the necessary policies and proposals required for a Core Strategy could put it at risk of being found unsound at Examination. Officers consider that the preparation and production of the Core Strategy complies with guidance in PPS12. However, should issues be raised subsequently, particularly regarding the technical evidence base and level of public consultation undertaken, the Council would have a further opportunity to review and amend the Plan, before progressing to the formal Examination stage.
RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

1. That Cabinet expresses its views on the Core Strategy Submission Document and associated Appendices and these comments be reported as a schedule of comments to be considered by Council.

2. Subject to 1 above, that Cabinet resolves: to recommend to Council to approve the main issues raised and the proposed response (Appendix 1), the schedules of proposed changes (Appendix 2), South Gloucestershire Core Strategy Submission document (Appendix 3), and the supporting Sustainability Appraisal (Appendix 4) for the purposes of:
   - Publicising for a 6 week period proposed changes to the Core Strategy Submission document as set out in Appendix 2.
   - submission to the Secretary of State.

3. That delegated authority be given to the Director of Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment in consultation with the Executive Member for Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment to:
   a). Make any necessary minor drafting amendments to the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy prior to submission
   b). Make any necessary changes of a minor factual and editing nature to complete the Sustainability Appraisal Report to support the Core Strategy Submission document.
   c). Approve and publish the necessary supporting evidence base/technical studies, including the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, New Neighbourhoods Delivery Statement and updated SHLAA to support the Core Strategy Submission document and relevant Proposals Map extracts.
   d). To prepare the necessary documentation required to submit the Core Strategy to the Secretary of State.
   e). To consider comments received on the proposed changes to the Core Strategy that arise during the 6 week publicity period and any potential implications for the Core Strategy that arise from government guidance up to and including the Public Examination.
   f). To make arrangements for the organisation and commencement of the Core Strategy Examination in Public.

4. That the Core Strategy Submission document is confirmed as a key material consideration for the purposes of exercising the Council’s development management functions.
5. To inform all town and parish councils, local MPs and stakeholders of the Plan’s availability and arrangements for publicising the suggested changes as soon as practically possible following the Council decision.

**Author**
Peter Jackson, Director of Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment

**Departmental Contact(s)**
Barbara Maksymiw, Head of Planning and Environment (PTSE)
Telephone 01454 3444
Email: Barbara.maksymiw@southglos.gov.uk

Patrick Conroy, Spatial Planning Team Leader (PTSE)
Telephone: 01454 863574
Email: Patrick.conroy@southglos.gov.uk

**Appendices**

Appendix 1 Key Issues and officer response to the Core Strategy
Appendix 2 Schedule of suggested changes to the Core Strategy
Appendix 3 Core Strategy Submission document with suggested changes incorporated
Appendix 4 Sustainability Appraisal

**Background Papers**

Draft South West Regional Spatial Strategy, Secretary of State Proposed Changes, published July 2008

GOSW letter to all South West Council Chief Executive Officers, December 2009

South Gloucestershire Council Urgent Decision by PTSE Executive Councillor Core Strategy Work Programme, October 2009

South Gloucestershire Council Local Development Scheme (approved April 2009)

South Gloucestershire Local Plan (adopted 2006)


Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing, 2006

Secretary of State and Chief Planning officer letters to Chief Planning Officers, 10th November 2010
Cabinet
Monday, 13th December, 2010

Present

Councillors: Brian Allinson, John Calway, Sheila Cook, Heather Goddard, John Godwin, Allan Higgs and Matthew Riddle.

240 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS (Agenda Item 1)

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

241 EVACUATION PROCEDURE (Agenda Item 3)

The Chair drew attention to the evacuation procedure as set out in the agenda.

242 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 (Agenda Item 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brian Allinson</th>
<th>Stoke Gifford Parish Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Calway</td>
<td>Oldland Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Cook</td>
<td>Almondsbury Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Goddard</td>
<td>Hanham Parish Council and Hanham Abbots Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Godwin</td>
<td>Winterbourne Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Higgs</td>
<td>Winterbourne Parish Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Councillor M Riddle declared 2 personal interests in item 10 on the Core Strategy for the following reasons:

i) He was a resident in Oldbury Lane, Thornbury which is referred to in Chapter 15.

ii) He rents farmland to a farmer who also farms the land at Park Farm, which was the proposed site for development adjacent to Castle School.

243 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS AS SCHOOL GOVERNORS (Agenda Item 5)
ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC (Agenda Item 6)

Bus and Rail Services

A statement had previously been circulated to members of the Cabinet by Dave Redgewell on behalf of South West Transport Network concerning buses and rail in the Greater Bristol Area.

Core Strategy

Rob Hudson (Save Thornbury Green Heritage) raised the following issues:

i) Community opposition to Park Farm
ii) The reasons for ‘defensible boundary’ of Morton way being more significant than at Park Farm is not made clear.
iii) Site development boundary shown in Figure 13 is unclear
iv) Park farm is not the only option capable of enabling castle School to consolidate
v) There is no longer any valid justification for Park Farm option 6
vi) The destruction of a historic deer park adjoining Thornbury Castle, St Mary’s Church and the Medieval Fishponds.

Charles Eardley-Wilmott (Concern Thornbury) raised the following issues:

i) Why was reference to the workshop deleted in view of its previous importance in championing Option6?
ii) The Inspector stated in 2006 that no additional houses were needed and that Park Farm was the last site of all sites that should be developed.
iii) What is meant by “limited access” and how will access across “Environmental Development buffer Strip” be achieved? to be made between the 2 parts of Park Farm.
iv) In view of the Castle School Governors reconsideration of revisions affecting access road to Park Road going through the playing fields. When will the public consultation on the future of education in Thornbury commence plus excess primary school places redesignation?
Dr V Costello resident of Thornbury and Member of Save Thornbury’s Green Heritage raised to following issues:

i) Lack of consultation particularly in respect of revised illustrative diagrams.
ii) What happens to the ‘Frog Spawn’ shown on Figure 13 beyond the boundaries of the diagrams?
iii) Destruction of historical and ecological environment
iv) Lack of imagination in the development of the strategy.

Rosemary Burton, resident of Thornbury and Member of Save Thornbury’s Green Heritage raised a number of issues concerning Chapter 15 of the Core Strategy. In particular:

i) the justification and process for more housing in Thornbury is not based on robust and credible evidence, particularly falling school rolls and changes in age structure.
ii) the justification and community benefit for locating housing at Park Farm has not been clearly made/ not based on sustainability grounds.
iii) Site development boundary shown in Figure 13 is unclear.
iv) Design implications of the recent changes to Figure 13 concerning Park farm area illustrate an unsuitable site for housing development.

Rob Duff, Pegasus Planning Group spoke in support of the Core Strategy. He considered it would bring a lot to the Community in Thornbury, helping to address the issues of declining and aging population, falling primary school rolls, support the town centre and community facilities and enable the Castle School to fulfil its objectives. On behalf of Barratt Homes, he confirmed his client is fully supportive of working with the Council and Local Community Leaders to undertake detailed master planning and public engagement. He also explained that technical work had confirmed the issues of flooding, ecology, heritage and conservation were not constraints to the site.

The Leader of the Council confirmed that a response to the issues raised by members of the public would be addressed during consideration of the Core Strategy item.

245 ITEMS FROM MEMBERS (Agenda Item 7)

Second Homes and Council Tax

Councillor Tyzack made reference to the flexibility afforded to councils in the application of Council tax with regard to second homes for Members of Parliament. Councillor Tyzack requested the number of second homes. The Chief finance Officer agreed to respond in writing and circulate to all members.
Core Strategy

Councillor Clare Fardell raised a number of areas of concern including the need for 500 houses and why Park Farm had been chosen as the preferred site. She also suggested that the current document contains significant features which have not been consulted on such as:

- the possible benefit to Castle School
- whether all traffic will exit via Butt Lane or onto Park Road or divided between the two.

Also she asked if the Council could undertake to provide residents of Thornbury with a well constructed and advertised exhibition to explain the choice of Park Farm to ensure people were properly informed of the proposals ahead of the public examination.

The Leader of the Council gave an undertaking that he would support this provided it was supported by the Thornbury Steering Group. He suggested that a meeting take place with the Steering Group, local member and Officers to look at the most positive way of taking forward this request.

Councillor Pat Hockey referred to the late submission of representations from developers and how they would be dealt with. Patrick Conroy confirmed that developers had already made representations to the Core Strategy during the formal consultation period. These letters were repeating their justification for the sites being included in the Core Strategy. The letters would therefore be treated as additions to the original representations made by the developers which had already been take account of in the Core Strategy.

246 ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIR DECIDES ARE URGENT (Agenda Item 8)

The Chairman changed the order of business by moving Item 12, the report on the RSG Announcement, Budget and Council Tax, to the end of the agenda.

247 MINUTES AND FOLLOW UP ACTION (Agenda Item 9)

Resolved: That the minutes of the meeting held on 1 November 2010 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

248 SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE CORE STRATEGY: SUBMISSION TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Agenda Item 10)

Cabinet considered the formal submission of the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy to the Secretary of State for independent examination.

The Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment presented the Core Strategy document for submission to the
Secretary of State.

The Director of Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment introduced the information published in the Cabinet papers and explained to members each of the documents. He also confirmed that 5 additional documents had been circulated to the meeting as follows:

i) Coloured Illustrative Maps

The agenda papers had been circulated in greyscale. Coloured maps assisted the Cabinet with greater clarity.

ii) Appendix 5 SGC Core Strategy Changes to the Proposal Map

Under the current planning system Proposals Maps are not produced for individual documents in the Local Development Framework. Instead one Proposals Map is maintained and updated on a rolling basis as DPDs are prepared. The South Gloucestershire Proposals Map at the present time comprises the extant policies and proposals in the South Gloucestershire Local Plan and the Waste and Minerals Local Plan. This will be updated following the adoption of the Core Strategy and the Joint Waste Core Strategy.

Recommendation 3(e) of the Cabinet report seeks delegated authority from the Director of PTSE and the Executive Member for PTSE to approve the changes that will need to be made to the Proposals Map (following adoption of the Core Strategy) to take account of the Submission Core Strategy.

These Proposals Map changes are now included as Appendix 5 to the Cabinet report.

iii) Comments of the Draft Core Strategy Following the Joint Meeting of 8 December 2010 PT&SE Select, Development Control (East and (West) Committees

iv) Addendum to Cabinet Report 13 December 2010 on the Core Strategy

The Addendum paper includes a complete version of Chapter 18 Major Infrastructure Projects. The references in italics indicate changes to the wording since the Cabinet papers were published following further legal advice received.

v) Update to Cabinet Report and Recommendation Submission Core Strategy

Patrick Conroy then took Members through the comments of the Draft Core Strategy following the Joint Meeting of 8 December 2010 PT&SE Select, Development Control (East and (West) Committees. There were a number of slight amendments to the tabled document as follows:
- CS20 the recommended changes had been accepted by Officers
- Para 10.54 the word “Individuals” should be changed to “Residents”
- Figure 5 (The North Fringe of Bristol Urban Area Map) the Frog Spawn should not wrap around the airfield runway.

The Cabinet indicated their agreement to the recommended changes.

Barbara Maksymiw then took Members through the Addendum to Cabinet Report 13 December 2010 on the Core Strategy.

There were a number of slight amendments to the tabled document as follows:

- CS5(4) delete the words “from an” after “...subject to the resolution of flood risk...”
- Para 18.8 Insert a new form of words to replace the existing text as follows: “Further reforms to the planning system....”
- CS37 Bullet Point 4 Revised wording to be considered and submitted in the composite schedule to Full Council

The Cabinet indicated their agreement to the recommended changes.

Patrick Conroy then took members through the proposed changes to the Core Strategy contained at Appendix 3 of the full report which was the Core Strategy document. Mr Conroy explained the changes that were proposed to be made to the Core Strategy by way of deletions of text, shown as strike through and the addition of new text, shown as underlined. This was undertaken on a chapter by chapter basis with the Leader of the Council inviting members to raise any issues as the presentation and explanation of the changes was made proceeded.

At the relevant points in the Core Strategy Mr Conroy took the opportunity to make reference to a number of letters of representation received as follows:

i) White Young Green Planning and Design expressed concerns on the proposed North Yate New Neighbourhood to deliver 3000 homes and up to 9 ha of employment land, putting forward their client’s land at Engine Common to support housing development in Yate.

ii) Grass Roots Planning expressed concern that the selected growth that the council is pursuing in its Core Strategy was too low and asked the Council to address this by accepting their client’s land at Shortwood Golf Course.

Patrick confirmed that these representations would be added to the original representations made and that the Core Strategy document already took account of these representations.

Patrick also responded to the comments made by members of the public
objecting to housing development at Thornbury and the identification of Park Farm as the preferred site as follows by detailing:

- the evidence for additional housing given demographic, social and economic challenges facing Thornbury as detailed in the Sustainability Appraisal support the Core Strategy at Appendix 4
- It was agreed that Figure 13 of the Core Strategy would be amended to clearly show the boundary for the Park Farm site.
- the positive effect on Thornbury as a result of additional housing to the population and age structure of the Town, school rolls and community facilities.
- the benefits of consolidating Castle School to a single site.
- how the historical and ecological environments would be respected and protected
- how Park Farm was the right location and would integrate well into the town compared to other alternatives as set out in the Sustainability Appraisal support the Core Strategy at Appendix 4

Resolved:

1. That Cabinet expresses its views on the Core Strategy Submission Document and associated Appendices, the Addendum paper and the comments of the Joint PT&SE Select Committee and Development Control Committees and that Cabinet's comments on the above be reported as a schedule of comments to be considered by Council.

2. That the full Council be recommended to approve the main issues raised and the proposed response (Appendix 1), the schedules of proposed changes (Appendix 2), South Gloucestershire Core Strategy Submission document (Appendix 3), and the supporting Sustainability Appraisal (Appendix 4) and the changes to the Proposals Map (Appendix 5) for the purposes of:

   - Publicising for a 6 week period proposed changes to the Core Strategy Submission document as set out in Appendix 2.

   - submission to the Secretary of State.

3. That delegated authority be given to the Director of Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment in consultation with the Executive Member for Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment to:

   a) Make any necessary minor drafting amendments to the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy and Proposals Map changes prior to submission

   b) Make any necessary changes of a minor factual and editing nature to complete the Sustainability Appraisal Report to support the Core Strategy Submission document.
c) Approve and publish the necessary supporting evidence base/technical studies, including the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, New Neighbourhoods Delivery Statement and updated SHLAA to support the Core Strategy Submission document.

d) To prepare the necessary documentation required to submit the Core Strategy to the Secretary of State.

e) To consider comments received on the proposed changes to the Core Strategy that arise during the 6 week publicity period and any potential implications for the Core Strategy that arise from government guidance up to and including the Public Examination.

f) To make arrangements for the organisation and commencement of the Core Strategy Examination in Public.

4. That the Core Strategy Submission document is confirmed as a key material consideration for the purposes of exercising the Council’s development management functions.

5. To inform all town and parish councils, local MPs and stakeholders of the Plan’s availability and arrangements for publicising the suggested changes as soon as practically possible following the Council decision.

Reasons for Decision

Approval of the Core Strategy will enable the Authority to submit the Core Strategy to the Secretary of State.


Cabinet considered a report to determine the Council Tax Bases for formal Council Tax setting purposes for 2011/12 and for indicative Council Tax Base forecast purposes for 2012/13, 2013/14 and 2014/15.

Resolved:

That in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Tax Base) Regulations 1992 the Cabinet approve:

a) the amount of the Tax Base, expressed as Band D equivalent properties, for South Gloucestershire Council for 2011/12 be determined as 90,769

b) the amount of the indicative forecast Tax Base, expressed as Band D equivalent properties, for South Gloucestershire Council for 2012/13 be determined as 90,996
c) the amount of the indicative forecast Tax Base, expressed as Band D equivalent properties, for South Gloucestershire Council for 2013/14 be determined as 91,223

d) the amount of the indicative forecast Tax Base, expressed as Band D equivalent properties, for South Gloucestershire Council for 2014/15 be determined as 91,451

e) the Tax Base for each of the Parish/Town Councils and the Unparished area, expressed as Band D equivalent properties, be determined as attached in Appendix A for 2011/12 and as indicative forecasts for 2012/13, 2013/14 and 2014/15.

2. That the Chief Financial Officer inform Parish/Town Councils, the Fire Authority, the Police Authority and the Environment Agency of the Tax Base to be used in 2011/12 and the indicative forecasts of the Tax Base to be used for 2012/13, 2013/14 and 2014/15.

Reason for Decision

To comply with statutory requirements.

250 JOINT LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN 3 (Agenda Item 13)

Cabinet considered a report on the final Joint Local Transport Plan (3) for approval by full Council.

Mr D Redgewell addressed the Cabinet and asked for the rail chapter to be strengthened to take account of recent government information. In addition he highlighted the potential for 'bus wars' whereby bus companies compete for passengers by duplicating services, arriving just slightly earlier and out-pricing competitors.

The Executive Member for Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment informed the Cabinet that he had invited the managing director of First Bus for a discussion with the West of England Partnership. In addition he was lobbying the Minister for Transport regarding the issue of Rolling Stock.

Resolved:

i) That Cabinet recommend the final draft JLTP3 for approval by full Council.

ii) That Cabinet recommend to Council to delegate authority to the Director of Planning, Transport and the Strategic Environment in consultation with the Executive Member to make minor amendments or any points of clarification prior to the JLTP3 being formally submitted to Government.
Reasons for Decision

The production of the JLTP3 is a statutory requirement. It must be approved by each of the four West of England Council’s ahead of submission to the Department for Transport in March 2011. The Joint Local Transport Plan (3) (JLTP3) replaces the current Joint Local Transport Plan (2) which sets the transport policy for the four authorities in the West of England. It reflects national goals as well as our community strategy, Council Plan and Core Strategy.

251 LOCALISM BILL (Agenda Item )

The Leader of the Council took the opportunity to inform the meeting that the Localism Bill debate scheduled for 15 December 2010 had been postponed. Once the bill was received it would be taken to PAG to allow members the opportunity to discuss it at a specially arranged meeting in January.

All members would be informed that the proposed pre-council meeting on 15 December was postponed and the revised arrangements.

252 REPORT OF THE CORPORATE CO ORDINATION SELECT COMMITTEE FOLLOWING THE CALL IN OF THE CABINET DECISION ON THE COMMUNITY STRATEGY, COUNCIL PLAN, AND BUDGET (Agenda Item 14)

Cabinet considered a report on the outcome of the Corporate Co-Ordination Select Committee Call in of the Cabinet Decision on the Community Strategy, Council Plan, and Budget (Parts (a), (d), (e), (f), and (g)).

Councillor Howard Gawler, Chair of the Corporate co-ordination Select Committee introduced the report.

Resolved: The Cabinet is committed to proper and on-going consultation in respect of proposals set out in the October cabinet report. We welcome the Select Committee’s review of the proposals, their acceptance of them in principle, and the recommendation that a consultation plan should be produced. Officers have produced a draft overarching plan and are in discussion with groups to ensure that the final version meets the needs and requirements of the Select Committee. This will be published as a matter of priority once these discussions have concluded.
REPORT OF THE PLANNING TRANSPORTATION AND STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENT SELECT COMMITTEE REVIEW - "NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS - COUNTERING THE THREAT TO ECOLOGICAL DIVERSITY AND SOCIAL COHESION" (Agenda Item 15)

The Cabinet received the report of the Planning Transportation and Strategic Environment Select Committees "New Residential Developments - Countering The Threat To Ecological Diversity And Social Cohesion"

Councillor P Hockey, Chair of the Review Group took Members through the report highlighting the salient issues. Councillor Hockey took the opportunity to thank both officers, in particular Gordon Moss, and members for all their hard work during the course of the Select Committees review.

Resolved:

That the report of the Select Committee be received and considered during the next item of business.

Reason for the decision

To fully consider the recommendations of the Planning Transportation and Strategic Environment Select Committee.

CONSIDERATION OF THE PLANNING TRANSPORTATION AND STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENT SELECT COMMITTEE REVIEW - "NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS - COUNTERING THE THREAT TO ECOLOGICAL DIVERSITY AND SOCIAL COHESION" (Agenda Item 16)

The Cabinet considered a report that set out the recommendations of the Planning Transportation and Strategic Environment Select Committees "New Residential Developments - Countering The Threat To Ecological Diversity And Social Cohesion", together with appropriate Officer advice.

In respect of Recommendation 1 the Leader asked the Cabinet Member for Communities to look at more pro-active response showing the value of Brownfield loose space sites.

Resolved:

i) That Cabinet accepts the officer comments as set out below as its formal response:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Cabinet Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. That Cabinet directs relevant officers when developing future open space provision, to recognise the potential play/ecological value of brownfield sites</td>
<td>Agreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It is important to recognise the potential of this type of space. When planning or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
developing future open space provision officers consider the value of this kind of space (often termed informal open space). When open space and a suitable maintenance regime are planned a number of factors have to be balanced, including appropriate maintenance needed to retain its recreational/play value, public safety and ecological integrity.

- Through Streetcare and the friends groups, reduced maintenance regimes are already used to keep costs down where appropriate and safe to do so and officers are exploring more opportunities to do this where appropriate. We are open to ideas which help reduce costs, improve the local environment and meet community expectation.

- It should be noted there are potential conflicts with those who see spaces that aren't maintained as neglected and attractive to undesirable activities.

2. Cabinet directs relevant officers to report back within 12 months on:-

a) the implications of, and options for, providing access to public toilet facilities within reasonable walking distance of any current and future area of "park-like" open space within/adjacent to a residential/built up area. These options should include:- the opening up of existing toilet facilities in community buildings to the general public beyond the building itself; public toilet facilities serving new "park-like" open space; and by more imaginative shared access to existing/planned facilities (eg, within large shops, libraries and health centres.)

b) the issues involved in ensuring all current and future open space adjacent to formal play areas are provided with seating and simple shelters

c) the issues involved in providing basic infrastructure to facilitate kiosk type refreshment outlets and for community

Agreed

- A report on these issues will be prepared in the next 12 months. Public toilet provision is important as is seating and infrastructure in parks and open spaces. There are considerable practical challenges and revenue cost implications associated with providing dedicated public toilets.
That measures be introduced, the effects of which will be that all major sites and/or those sites where ecological concerns have been raised by Members, should be subject to an ecological survey and that any such development site should protect or enhance the ecological value of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. That a system be set in place through the Council’s local Planning Application Requirements List (PAR) to ensure that, should a small site application or speculative application for a site arise, there is a requirement on the applicant to produce an ecological survey and a statement as to how the ecology will be safeguarded and enhanced.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Agreed in part**

- Sufficient powers are already available to the local authority to request that a survey be prepared for all sites where it is apparent that ecological issues are of importance. Officers will request this on a case by case basis. A blanket requirement for an ecological survey to be prepared in all cases, regardless of whether there are any ecological issues involved, is not considered to be proportionate to the benefits. The Government’s, and council’s aims in revising the Local PAR has been to streamline the list of requirements to reduce unnecessary bureaucracy and red tape.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. That the lack of an ecological survey or the inadequacy of an ecological survey, or identified harm to ecology, inform a reason for refusing an application.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Agreed**

- As is the case with all material considerations, if the judgement is that there is demonstrable evidence that harm would be caused by granting planning permission in the absence of an ecological survey, and that this deficiency could not be reasonably addressed by other means, (such as through conditional approval) then the absence of a survey could form the basis of a reason for refusal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>That planning officers be requested to provide developers with guidance on the requirements relating to hedgerows, and tree and hedge surveys, as part of the planning permission checklist (PAR) – with a view to reducing the likelihood of such features being moved before a development takes place.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreed in part</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The thrust of this recommendation is agreed with and, where ecological issues have been identified as being likely to be a relevant consideration in the determination of a planning application, guidance will be given to applicants (and potential applicants) by the council’s Ecologist. However it is not technically possible to achieve this through the PAR, since this is a list of the documents required to be submitted as part of a planning application,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>That officers be asked to investigate the potential contribution of parish councils and/or other amenity groups, possibly co-ordinated by environmental link groups, to establish a photographic and/or other survey record, of areas of ecological value which can be added to the evidence base kept already by the council and that evidence referred to and accessed by ecology officers when giving their advice on planning applications.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- This already being investigated through joint working with the environmental link groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. That confidential emergency contact arrangements be made available to members with a view to expediting member contact with the appropriate officers when Members become aware of site clearances which appear to them to be illegal/inappropriate, so that, if appropriate, emergency action can be taken to halt the clearance with immediate effect until the situation can be properly assessed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreed in part</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A guidance card for members on how to report various planning enforcement issues with the relevant contact numbers is already in existence, and has been previously sent to all members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There is currently no formal out-of-hours planning enforcement service. To date the council has identified circumstances where there is an enhanced risk of unauthorised activity taking place out-of-hours and has successfully managed the risks in an informal manner. This has proved cost effective and has provided sufficient protection, on the rare occasions when breaches have occurred. It is proposed to continue with this risk based approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The concept of providing emergency telephone numbers for councillors runs counter to the current policy of reducing special telephone numbers, and special access for members. The most efficient and effective practice for problems within office hours is to direct all calls to customer management and train staff there how to deal with the individual calls. For out of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hours problems, there is an emergency procedure already in place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>That the Director (PTSE) seeks to ensure that the advice of suitably qualified officers in the assessment of ecological/landscaping issues is sought where enforcement officers are monitoring sites.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Agreed | • A guidance card for members on how to report various planning enforcement issues with the relevant contact numbers is already in existence, and has been previously sent to all members.
• An advice card for members on tree and hedgerow legislation will be prepared and circulated to Members |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>That Members be reminded:-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| | i) they have a very important role in ensuring that they involve themselves at the earliest stages in the consideration of any development, and draw the attention of officers to ecological issues they are aware of through the benefit of their local knowledge at the earliest stages so that officers can ensure that these ecological issues are taken into account.

ii) they have an important role to provide ‘challenge’ in the determination of planning applications to ensure that that council’s policies on ecological issues (as with any other policy requirement) are being achieved and that this role can be more effective the earlier it is undertaken.

iii) that where ecological concerns are raised by members at a late stage in the determination of an application, it is often very difficult for the Council to demonstrate the reasonableness of its behaviour to developers, and makes success at any potential appeal less likely. |
| Agreed | • Where members are aware of ecological or other issues that are material to the determination of planning applications, these should be brought to the attention of the case officer at the earliest possible stage.
• The case officer will ensure that appropriate specialists are consulted through the established planning consultation procedures.
• The earlier concerns are raised the easier it is to ensure that additional information can be sought to enable a proper assessment to be made as part of the planning process. Where additional surveys or reports are required these can delay the determination of applications and requests for additional information must be justifiable as reasonable where this would result in a delay to the determination of an application.
• Where hedgerows are believed to be at risk Members should inform the planning enforcement team in the first instance who will liaise with the Council’s Tree officers or ecologist as appropriate |
iv) that though the majority of hedgerows may be protected as Ancient Hedges, some are not. However, they may still have significant ecological value, therefore Members are advised to inform ecological officers or planning enforcement officers where they believe such hedges are under threat.

2a. That Cabinet agrees it is a matter of grave concern that the long term maintenance of open space as currently practised will become an ever growing financial burden to the authority because in most cases the cost of public open space maintenance eventually falls to the local authority once any bonds have expired.

b. That subject to agreeing Recommendation 12a, officers investigate and report back within 3 months:

a) whether the increasing cost of open space maintenance is at least partially avoidable by negligible intervention on areas which do not need closely cut grass to function; the implications of such a change for ecological diversity, and the resultant increased provision of informal play space (loose space).

b) whether it is appropriate to:

i) adopt a revised approach to the maintenance of existing highway verges, roundabout islands, etc, such that they are allowed to develop a more natural appearance requiring a different (significantly reduced) order of maintenance subject to the restrictions pertaining the existence of any services within some verges.

ii) to request the Highways Agency to consider adopting a revised approach to the maintenance of existing motorway verges, junctions etc such that they are allowed to develop a more natural appearance which require a different

Agreed.

- Officers are exploring the options for private maintenance of open space as a more financially sustainable option. Officers are also exploring ways of reducing maintenance costs through adapting maintenance regimes (see above). A report completed in 6 months rather than 3 would be more comprehensive and effective.

- Note the term "bond" has been used in place of "commuted sum". It is a commuted sum which is sought from developers to cover costs of maintenance of open space, usually for a period of 15 years.
3. That, in planning major new development sites, officers seek to encourage the development of footpaths within new developments which are wider and are managed to develop a more "rural" appearance.

Agreed
- Officers will seek to ensure that footpaths within new developments are designed to accommodate both pedestrians and cyclists safely, whilst respecting the landscape setting of the development.

4. Officers be instructed to expedite the preparation of an options report within 3 months, to include an investigation of the approach taken by Braintree Council on the potential role of management companies for the future design and maintenance of open space in new developments, and how this might involve community based groups, parish councils, and the District Council.

Agreed
- Officers are actively considering the best approach for the private management of open space and as part of the work, officers will contact Braintree Council.
  - A report completed in 6 months rather than 3 would be more comprehensive and effective.

5. That in accordance with legal advice set out in the conclusion to Appendix 7 to this report, the Council should seek to ensure that residential units shall not be occupied until an approved scheme has been approved for the life of the development, relating to the management of the communal open space areas of the development and that where possible those schemes should seek to protect and or enhance ecological diversity.

Agreed
- There are five tests to apply where considering the imposition of conditions on a planning decision, and this assessment must be made on a case-by-case basis, rather than being pre-determined as this proposal suggests. However, as a matter of course in determining planning applications officers and members will wish to ensure that appropriate and reasonable arrangements have been made for the provision and future maintenance of any communal open space where it is in the public interest to do so. The advice set out in Appendix 7 to the report is relevant.

6. That, subject to residents’ outdoor play/leisure needs being met, the conservation, promotion and enhancement of ecological diversity be the overarching principle guiding the development and maintenance of all current and future open space and that this be reflected in the implementation of the current Play Strategy and the development of the

Agreed
- The protection and enhancement of species and habitats, creation of new habitats and wildlife linkages between them are objectives of the green infrastructure policy CS2 in the emerging core strategy. Protecting, creating and improving recreational and play opportunities are also
objectives of this policy. Along with a range of other important considerations the objectives of play/leisure and ecological diversity will therefore be material to planning decisions that affect the development and maintenance of current and future open space.

- Core Strategy policy CS24 recognises that the functionality and usability of open spaces must be suitable for their intended purposes; this will be expanded upon in the GI Strategy. The objectives of the Play Strategy have been taken into account in emerging core strategy policies and will also be taken into account in the development of the GI strategy.

**Reason for the decision**

To respond to the Select Committee’s report and recommendations.

255  **STRATEGIC PERFORMANCE REPORT - QUARTER 2 2010/11** (Agenda Item 17)

Cabinet considered the report which outlined the second quarter performance against the Councils’ strategic performance indicators.

**Resolved:**

That Cabinet:

i) notes the overall performance and approve the actions identified

ii) note that this is the last performance report that Cabinet will receive in this format

iii) task officers with the responsibility for developing a new performance management framework

**Reason for the decision**

To ensure robust monitoring of progress against the set of strategic performance indicators

256  **RSG ANNOUNCEMENT, BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX** (Agenda Item 12)

Cabinet received a holding report on the expected RSG announcement and its implications for the budget and council tax for 2011/12 and after.
The Leader of the Council reported that the Cabinet were aware that the RSG announcement was being made today (13 December). In order to consider the implications of this on cabinet’s budget proposals, it was proposed to adjourn the meeting to the morning of Monday 20 December 2010 when this report would be considered. An update report would be produced and distributed as soon as the RSG announcement has been considered.

Resolved: That the Cabinet meeting be adjourned and reconvene on the morning of 20 December 2010 when an update report on the RSG Announcement will be considered.

Meeting closed 5.45 pm

Chair
Purpose of Report

1. This report is a covering report. The report to Cabinet on the 13 December 2010 on the Core Strategy is attached to this paper. It provides the full information available at the time of agenda despatch.

2. A joint meeting of the PT&SE Select Committee and the two Development Control Committees will take place on the 8 December 2010. The Cabinet meeting will take place on the 13 December 2010. Council will receive an update report from these two meetings when it meets on the 15 December 2010.

Author and Departmental Contact

Stuart Hook, Head of Democratic and Statutory Services, 01454863053
COUNCIL
Wednesday, 15 December 2010

PRESENT
Councillors: Brian Allinson, Jane Allinson, John Ashe, June Bamford, Nick Barrett, David Bell, Janet Biggin, Ian Blair, Linda Boon, Malcolm Bridge, John Calway, Roger Coales, Sheila Cook, Kay Crowe, Ken Dando, Ruth Davis, Mike Drew, Clare Fardell, Brian Freeguard, Howard Gawler, Heather Goddard, John Goddard, John Godwin, Sandra Grant, Kenneth Graupner, Neil Halsall, Dave Hockey, Pat Hockey, Shirley Holloway, Sue Hope, Brian Hopkinson, Justin Howells, Colin Hunt, James Hunt, Robert Jones, Trevor Jones, Geoff King, Alan Lawrance, Valerie Lee, Carol McCarthy, Sheila Mead, Adrian Millward, Sandra O'Neill, Andy Perkins, Sarah Porffret, Shirley Potts, Christine Price, Bob Pullin, Matthew Riddle, Mike Robbins, Pat Rooney, Marc Scawen, Kevin Seager, Ian Smith, Mike Thomas, Sarah Turley, Maggie Tyrrell, Peter Tyszack, Julie Walker, Sue Walker, Terry Walker, Jon Williams, Jan Woodley and Claire Young

52 EVACUATION PROCEDURE (Agenda Item 1)
The Chair welcomed everybody to the meeting and explained that she intended to move the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy item to follow the public speaking item to allow the public in attendance to hear the debate without having to wait until other agenda items had been dealt with.

The Chair of Council drew attention to the emergency evacuation procedure as set out in the Agenda.

53 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 2)
Apologies for absence were received from
Councillors: Ian Morris, Allan Higgs, Keith Cranney, Roger Hutchinson, Tony Olpin, David Upjohn,
Aldermen: Denis Beer
54 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 (Agenda Item 3)

The following declarations of interest were made:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor's Name</th>
<th>Item number and Nature of Interest</th>
<th>Personal or Personal and Prejudicial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Matthew Riddle    | Item 10 – Review of Statement of Licensing Policy - Cider producer and holder of an alcohol Licence  
 Item 12 – Core Strategy - Lives in Oldbury Lane which is referenced within the chapter for Thornbury in the Core Strategy and rents farmland to a farmer who in turn rents land off Park Farm. | Personal and prejudicial |
| Geoff King        | Item 13 – JLTP(3) – Employed by First Group | Personal |
| Mike Drew         | 12 – Core Strategy - Trustee of land affected by the Core Strategy | Personal and prejudicial |
| Alan Lawrance     | 12 – Core Strategy - Trustee of The Wills Davis Attwell Trust | Personal and prejudicial |
| Clare Fardell     | 12 – Core Strategy – Governor at Castle School | Personal |
| Claire Young      | 12 – Lives next to the showman site which is proposed to be safeguarded | Personal |

55 MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE 28 JULY 2010 (Agenda Item 4)

The minutes were amended to correct minute number 38 to read “Councillor Peter Tyzack presented the Pilning and Severn Beach Parish Plan to Council”.

Subject to that amendment, the minutes were signed as a correct record by the Chair.

56 CHAIR’S ANNOUNCEMENTS (Agenda Item 5)

The following announcements were made:

- A country wide project called “sing up” has 25,000 school taking part. Of that number 44 have platinum status and the Chair was pleased to be able to report that 2 schools in South Glos are in this category.
- The Chair reported that she had attended a carol service at Clifton Cathedral on the 7th December which was very enjoyable.
• The Chair also announced that the household waste collection now recycled envelopes.

The Chair announced the following awards that had been received since the last Council meeting:

• Democratic and Statutory Services have been awarded Customer Service Excellence.
• Legal Services have been recommended for re-accreditation of Lexcel which is the quality mark of the law society
• The HR and Staff Development Team in Community Care and Housing won the Skills for Care Accolades award for Best Continuing Professional Development of Social Workers.
• 33 staff from Transportation Services passed the Construction Skills Certification Scheme test which is a recognised national scheme to promote the safety of personnel on construction sites.

57 ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC (agenda item 6)

Mr John Dixon spoke to Council making representation on the importance of electrification of local rail lines, called for support for retention of the Severn Beach line and re-opening of the Portishead line. Mr Dixon highlighted the need for works to signalling at Templemeads and for repair works to shelters on Severn Beach and Yate Platforms. Finally Mr Dixon called for support to maintain bus routes to ensure a cohesive bus network.

It was agreed that the matter would be referred to the Executive Councillor for Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment (PT&SE).

Mr Paul Vernell spoke to Council on behalf of NUT and drew attention to the concerns that NUT have in regard to cuts to services. My Vernell drew attention to a document that had been created by members of NUT in Central Services. Mr Vernell spoke of his belief that cuts to back office services would affect front line services and called for a reconsideration of strategic decisions and for further consultation.

It was agreed that the matter be referred to the Executive Councillor for Children and Young People

Mr Nick Carver spoke to Council calling for support for the Frampton End Road petition. Mr Carver invited the Executive Councillor for PT&SE to walk the road together with local residents. Mr Carver called for the Highways department to review, consult and look at practical options to consider ways of making the road safer for use by all concerned but especially for horse riders, cyclist and walkers.
It was agreed that the matter would be referred to the Executive Councillor for PT&SE. Councillor Allinson advised that both he and the Director for PT&SE would be glad to take up the invitation to meet with local residents.

Mr Williams who was a resident of Chipping Sodbury and was also speaking on behalf of the Save our Sodbury group spoke to Council on the Core Strategy item expressing concerns in regard to the Barnhill Development. Council heard that the development proposed was unpopular locally and that the proposal for a Waitrose supermarket and 200 houses was objected to because:

1. Flooding danger – Mr Williams gave examples of St Johns Way and Brook Street flooding in recent years. Mr Williams explained that he believed the proposed site increased the risk of flooding
2. The adverse impact that a Waitrose store would have on the vitality of local businesses
3. Only patchy information was available about the infill programme but up to 170 lorry movements are expected per day
4. A meeting of Sodbury residents rejected the proposals

Mr Williams concluded by urging Council to reject the relevant part of the Core Strategy.

It was agreed that Council would take account of the comments made when debating the Core Strategy item later in the meeting.

Christine Rickard, representing Save Thornbury Green Heritage spoke to Council on the Core Strategy item expressing concerns in regard to the Thornbury Area. Christine Rickard expressed concerns around the adequacy of the consultation process and also expressed the view that 500 houses for Thornbury at the Park Farm site was inappropriate. Christine Rickard believed that the site was not as sustainable as Council had been advised because it was more than 10 minutes walk to the Town Centre, yet an Inspector in a 2006 appeal considered the Town Centre to be a 20 min walk. Council heard reasons supporting the opinion that the site would be detrimental to heritage issues.

In conclusion Council was urged to reject the Thornbury section in the Core Strategy.

It was agreed that Council would take account of the comments made when debating the Core Strategy item later in the meeting.

Dr Vincent Costello, a Thornbury resident spoke to Council on the Core Strategy and its impact on Thornbury. Dr Costello recognised the billions of pounds of property development that the Core Strategy would bring to the area. However, Dr Costello expressed the view that he was appalled by the lack of logic in the document and highlighted that he believed the original appraisal document did not sufficiently take account of wildlife. Dr Costello advised Council that he felt that communication had not been as good as it could have been.
In closing Dr Costello explained that he felt the plan was flawed and urged Council to defer making a decision on the Thornbury section of the Core Strategy.

It was agreed that Council would take account of the comments made when debating the Core Strategy item later in the meeting.

Mr Rob Duff of Pegasus Planning group spoke to Council on the Thornbury Section of the Core Strategy.

Mr Duff expressed full support for Policy CS33 within the Core Strategy and stated that Barrattes will work collaboratively and fully with South Glos. Mr Duff explained that Pegasus Planning had held back from beginning their own public consultation so as not to prejudice the process being led by South Glos, and that he looked forward to working with the Council and community leaders to undertake further public consultation in the new year. Mr Duff explained his client had completed a lot of technical studies and had collected a significant amount of data. Mr Duff explained that he believed the criticism of the Core Strategy in relation to Thornbury to be unfounded. Firstly South Glos had undertaken additional consultation over and above that required, having completed a further proposed options stage. Secondly, he explained that Thornbury’s populations had been declining for some time and explained the adverse impact that this had on school numbers and the vitality of local business. Mr Duff also explained that the Park Farm site had been agricultural land for the last 1000 years, that a buffer could be provided to protect wildlife established there and that while the site was close to Thornbury Town Centre, improved links could be put in place.

In closing Mr Duff called for Councillors to support the Core Strategy.

58 SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE CORE STRATEGY: SUBMISSION TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE (agenda item 12)

Councillor Alan Lawrance left the meeting having declared a personal and prejudicial interest.

The Chair drew attention to the update information that had been provided.

Councillor Brian Allinson, Executive Councillor for PT&SE introduced and formally proposed the item. Councillor Pat Hockey seconded the item and reserved her right to speak later in the debate.

Councillor Mike Drew spoke to Council and explained that he felt the proposal for 3,000 houses in the Yate area would have a devastating effect and the area would not be able to cope with the additional traffic this would bring. However, he explained that local elected district and Yate Town councillors would continue to work with council officers and developers at north Yate. Councillor Drew then left the meeting having declared a personal and prejudicial interest.
The Chair of Council then invited Peter Jackson, Director of PT&SE and Patrick Conroy from the Spatial Planning Team to take Council through the Core Strategy.

Peter Jackson began the presentation and explained that the Core Strategy was a high level spatial planning document that once approved would replace the South Gloucestershire Council Local Plan. Until the time of its adoption, the Core Strategy would be given increasing weight in the consideration of planning applications.

Peter Jackson then explained that:

- 2,200 consultation responses had been received from 900 responders to the draft plan.
- The report before Council was to consider the changes proposed following consultation.
- The Core Strategy had been considered by a joint meeting of the Development Control Committees and PT&SE Select Committee and also by the Cabinet and that the comments from those meetings were summarised in the paperwork before members.
- The steps following the meeting would be to publicise the Core Strategy and submit the document to the Secretary of State with an examination in public which would take place in the second half of 2011. The results of the examination would be likely to be available towards the end of 2011 or early 2012 when the Plan could then be adopted. Once adopted, the plan would form the development plan for SGC.
- The paperwork before members comprised:
  - Main report on the item, provided either in the Council papers, the Cabinet papers or the Joint Development Control / PT&SE papers, the content of which was the same. This included:
    - A cover report
    - Appendix 1 - a schedule summarising the key issues raised in the consultation and proposed responses to these issues
    - Appendix 2 - the schedule of proposed changes to the Pre-Submission Draft Core Strategy following the consultation
    - Appendix 3 - the full version of the proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy, with proposed revisions to the Pre-Submission Draft shown as additional and deleted text.
    - Appendix 4 - the sustainability appraisal accompanying the proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy
  - A single sheet update report setting out the recommendations from Cabinet to Council
  - A supplementary report detailing the comments made at the joint meeting of the Development Control Committee and PT&SE Select Committee (and accepted by Cabinet), proposed further amendments recommended by the Cabinet and updates prepared by officers under delegated powers
  - Various written submissions from residents which had been received for the meeting
Appendix 5 – Proposed amendments to the Proposals Map
- Colour version of the set of maps contained in appendix 3 for ease of reference.

Patrick Conroy then took the meeting through the supplementary report drawing particular points to members' attention as detailed below:

- Page (P) 1 - Reference to the Localism Bill and its impact on the Core Strategy
- P1 – Minor amendment to wording of para 4.1 and 14.4
- P2 – Inclusion to references to network of nature reserves at Severnside
- P3 – Revised wording relating to Severnside throughout the document
- P4&5 – Changes to the description of Extra Care Housing policy
- P6 – Reference to Frenchay Hospital which had been amended
- P12 – Policy CS37 – an additional clause 4A has been added

Councillor Peter Tyzack suggested changing the wording of CS36 at criteria 4 where it referred specifically to nuclear power. Councillor Tyzack suggested the wording would be better placed in paragraph 18.1 and could then be removed from criteria 4 to be more readable. Revised wording as follows:

Para 18.1 amend to read: ‘Major Infrastructure Projects are large-scale projects of national importance such as new truck roads, airports, ports power stations, (including nuclear), waste water treatment works and chemical works.

Policy CS36 Criteria 4 to read: ‘Recognise the burden and disturbance borne by the community in hosting a major national or regional infrastructure project, particularly projects for the nuclear power industry. In recognition of the burden and disturbance to the community the Council will require packages of community benefits to be provided by the developer to offset and compensate the community for the burden imposed by hosting the project; and.

Council agreed to the suggested change to Policy CS36 and agreed the supplementary report.

Patrick Conroy then took the meeting through the Core Strategy a chapter at a time giving an explanation of the information in each chapter. After each chapter, the presentation paused and Councillors then asked questions or challenged the content of the document.

The meeting referred to appendix 3 for the main part of the presentation:

Part 1 – Chapters 1 - 4

The meeting received an overview of each chapter. No questions were asked of this part of the Core Strategy.
The meeting received an overview of each chapter. The following questions were asked or comments made:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question or Comment</th>
<th>Officer Response to Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Seagar – We have 37 recognised villages, what will be done to protect smaller ones that are being squeezed</td>
<td>The Core Strategy (CS) states that we will respect the character and identify of Communities and various measures are included to do this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Perkins – P302 refers to an early review of parking standards – what does early mean?</td>
<td>Earliest opportunity is likely to mean that the work will be completed by the mid to latter point of 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P301 CS8 - The Labour group submissions attempted to reflect that people have cars but parking is often not provided due to the proximity of bus routes. We would like the onus to be changed so that applicants have to demonstrate that they will not create extra parking on the road.</td>
<td>Officers agreed to take on board the spirit of what is being asked and will review the wording to produce an alternative using delegated powers as set out recommendations to Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 14 – there is a proliferation of shops being converted to takeaway and amusements arcades in town centres. How can this be controlled, why can't we be more prescriptive on these issues</td>
<td>The CS takes as robust an approach as is possible to maintaining retail uses at ground floor level. This is demonstrated within CS14 and the commitment to maintaining retail premises. The CS is a high level document, the next level of planning policies which will replace the SGLP will give more detailed consideration to these types of issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS18 - In the past representation has been made about the scale of development required to trigger the requirement to contribute to affordable housing. The trigger is now 10 and that is to be welcomed. Is it possible to have a graduated scaled for developments under 10 to prevent developers making applications of 9 or less to avoid the affordable housing contribution.</td>
<td>We have to set a threshold which balances viability and the need for affordable housing. The point is accepted and we will look at a graduated scale and contribution levels from smaller scale developments in the future as part of preparing the Sites and Policies DPD. It was explained that CS18 was an overarching policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Councillor Williams – CS 16 and levels of open space, is there any provision for allotments.

| Allotments are referred to a number of times in the CS. Policies CS23 and CS24 make specific reference to allotments as well as policies for the new neighbourhoods. |

Councillor Ruth Davies – CS 15 made reference to the housing numbers relevant to Yate and expressed the concerns of Yate Town Council. Cllr Davies also explained the risks of further amending Policy CS 15 and further delaying the Core Strategy.

| No response required. |

**Part 3 – Chapters 11-18**

The meeting received an overview of each chapter. The following questions were asked or comments made:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question or Comment</th>
<th>Officer Response to Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 12</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Godwin – Drew members attention to the figure 5 map at page 294 of the cabinet papers which had an incorrect depiction of the “frogspawn” around Filton airfield</td>
<td>Officers agreed to amend Figure 5 in order to be consistent with a similar change proposed in the supporting supplementary report to Figure 6. This correction is shown in page 6 of the supplementary report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 13</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Seagar – There do not appear to be any words to protect existing developments or will new developments have shopping centres.</td>
<td>CS 14 protects existing shopping centres and this is then taken forward in area based policies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 14</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Conroy drew attention to and summarised a letter from H Heeley, Ben Stokes, Becky Cotton and Erica Williams. These letters are attached as an appendix to the minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Conroy drew attention to and summarised a letter from WYG Planning Consultants on behalf of Sydney Freed (Holdings) and Bloor Homes and advised that their suggested amendment to include an additional allocation for mixed use development on land at Dyers Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mission Road Engine Common had been considered unsustainable and had not been included in the CS for reasons as stated in the supporting Sustainability Appraisal.

A letters from Paul and Wendy Whittle was also summarised.

The letters are attached as an appendix to the minutes

Councillor Boon expressed broad support for the protection the CS will afford. However, Chipping Sodbury residents were still divided and as such she would be abstaining from the vote.

Councillor Calway explained that through various correspondence there had been confusion regarding the Engine Common development and commented that some residents think the Council had put forward the proposed development. He was therefore pleased this important matter had been clarified as stated by Mr Patrick Conroy.

Councillor Davis explained that there had been cross party working on the CS and explained the history relating to the Yate Housing numbers. She explained that the CS requires the setting of housing targets. A response to the RSS stated that the Yate and Sodbury area could take an additional 5,000 houses, this figure was later reduced to 3,000. However the extra cars will go onto already congested roads. This issue of transport was the critical issue for the Yate members and that will be why those members will vote against the CS. However, Yate members are committed to ensuring the least worst option is put in place and will continue to work towards the implementation of the CS

Councillor Gawler – explained that Engine
Common was in his ward and that he had spoken to residents and will be showing them the Council papers to assure them that the scheme was not promoted by the.

Councillor Robbins – CS 31 He commented that the through road from Randolph Avenue is already in place and would be the only way to disperse the traffic from 3,000 houses which will be a disaster.

**Chapter 15**

Patrick Conroy summarised an e-mail he that had been received from Rob Hudson on behalf of STGH and a letter from Mark Phillips on behalf of the Peer Group which are attached as an appendix to the minutes. Patrick Conroy also summarised a phone call that had been received from the Chair of Governors at Castle School reiterating the schools commitment to the CS

Councillor Fardell – Read out a statement, in which she stated that she believes that Thornbury needed 500 new houses to boost the population. Cllr Fardell, thanked Cabinet for agreeing that an additional exhibition should be held and was pleased to report that a meeting had been arranged to discuss this with local Thornbury members on 21st December. Cllr Fardell believes more work is needed on handling traffic but that will exist wherever the development site is. Cannot see any evidence to suggest Park Farm would not be acceptable as a site. She stated that she would abstain from voting, but considered that she would be in a better position to consider her position in relation to the development when a detailed application had been received.

**Chapter 16**

Councillor Mike Thomas – It is pleasing to read that unique character of rural areas will be preserved in particular the Cotswold AONB & the greenbelt
Councillor Tyzack drew attention to the need for a link road to the motorway junction.

Chapter 18

Patrick Conroy drew members attention to the changes made in the addendum papers which had been circulated at the Cabinet meeting. The details were included in the supplementary schedule before Council which should be referred to.

Councillor Tyzack drew attention to the comments had had made earlier regarding nuclear power.

Councillor Calway explained that the Council had gone to great lengths on this section and had sought leading counsel’s opinion.

Part 4 – Chapters 19, Glossary of Terms, Appendix 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and Key Diagram

The meeting received an overview of each section.
No questions were asked of this part of the Core Strategy.
Patrick Conroy received applause from the meeting and Council thanked Patrick Conroy and his team for the work which they had undertaken.

During the debate, Councillor Ruth Davis thanked everyone who had worked on the Core Strategy, especially people from Yate and Sodbury areas.

Councillor Tyzack thanked Patrick Conroy and staff for the work in relation to the Severnside area.

Councillor Calway thanked Gill Sinclair for work in relation to the Major Infrastructure section.
As seconder, Councillor Pat Hockey thanked the team of officers and stressed the vigorous challenge that had been presented by members throughout the process.

Councillor Allinson added his thanks to officers and summed up as proposer.

The item was then put to the vote and with 53 voting in favour, 4 voting against and 4 abstentions, it was RESOLVED

1. That Council expresses its views as detailed in the minutes above on the Core Strategy Submission Document and associated Appendices and the Supplementary Report to the Full Council meeting which sets out the comments on the Draft Core Strategy following the Joint PTSE Select and DC Committee meeting on 8th December, the Cabinet meeting of 13th December 2010 and updates to the Core Strategy proposed under delegated authority.

2. Subject to 1 above, that Council resolves to approve the main issues raised and the proposed response (Appendix 1), the schedules of proposed changes (Appendix 2), South Gloucestershire Core Strategy Submission document (Appendix 3), the supporting Sustainability Appraisal (Appendix 4) and the changes to the Proposals Map (Appendix 5) for the purposes of:
   - Publicising for a 6-week period proposed changes to the Core Strategy Submission document as set out in Appendix 2
   - Submission to the Secretary of State.

3. That delegated authority be given to the Director of Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment in consultation with the Executive Member for Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment to:

   a). Make any necessary minor drafting amendments to the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy and Proposals Map changes prior to submission

   b). Make any necessary changes of a minor factual and editing nature to complete the Sustainability Appraisal Report to support the Core Strategy Submission document.

   c). Approve and publish the necessary supporting evidence base/technical studies, including the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, New Neighbourhoods Delivery Statement and updated SHLAA to support the Core Strategy Document

   d). To prepare the necessary documentation required to submit the Core Strategy to the Secretary of State.
e). To consider comments received on the proposed changes to the Core Strategy that arise during the 6 week publicity period and any potential implications for the Core Strategy that arise from government guidance up to and including the Public Examination.

f). To make arrangements for the organisation and commencement of the Core Strategy Examination in Public.

4 That the Core Strategy Submission document is confirmed as a key material consideration for the purposes of exercising the Council’s development management functions.

5. To inform all town and parish councils, local MPs and stakeholders of the Plan’s availability and arrangements for publicising the suggested changes as soon as practically possible following the Council decision.

Council agreed to a short adjournment.

Upon reconvening, Councillor O’Neill had left the meeting and Councillors Lawrance and Drew returned to the meeting.

59 PETITIONS (Agenda Item 7)

Councillor Perkins presented a petition that had been received by the Woodstock Council members from residents in Foxcote Road regarding vandalism which requested that the fence line be mended to help prevent the vandalism.

The petition was referred to the Executive Councillor for Communities.

60 QUESTIONS TO EXECUTIVE MEMBERS AND CHIEF OFFICERS UNDER Standing Order A31 (Agenda item 8)

The following questions and answers were asked under standing order A31:

To the Leader of Council

Question number 20 of 2010 from Councillor Dave Hockey

Since housing is currently responsible for about one third of the carbon emissions in South Gloucestershire and a 34% reduction against the 1992 level is required is required by law by 2020, what steps is the Council planning to take in the light of the Governments Green Deal proposals to ensure that:

a) This target is met?
Answer

Whilst we are awaiting details of the Green Deal in the Energy Security & Green Economy Bill which is due to be published shortly, in common with other Local Authorities, we are looking forward to the opportunities that the Green Deal will present. Although it is anticipated that energy efficiency measures will be funded by High Street suppliers, local authorities are expected to take 'strategic ownership' of the national roll out.

The Green Deal will replace the Government funded Warm Front programme and is due to launch in Autumn 2012 with detailed guidance expected in April 2012.

The funding commitment under the Green Deal shifts from the public to the private sector. The Government anticipates that 14 million homes will benefit from the Green Deal. Unlike current schemes, it is anticipated that more residents are likely to be helped as the means testing that is associated with current public funding will be removed.

We plan to build on the success that has already been achieved with our current schemes. In this context we plan to build on the work that we have already carried out regarding fuel poverty in a wider arena. The Green Deal will allow the Local Authority a key role in forming closer working relationships with Fuel Suppliers to ensure that our residents are getting the best deal possible. It is anticipated that the Local Authority will work in an intermediary and advisory capacity between the resident and the fuel supplier, the final details of this are yet to be confirmed. We already have a network of partners in place focusing on fuel poverty and promoting energy efficiency on a local basis. In addition, five homes in South Gloucestershire have benefited from retrofit measures under the pilot PAYS (Pay as you Save) scheme in anticipation of the Green Deal.

National monitoring and reporting of energy data commenced in 2005 and data is now available for 2005 to 2008. The revised 2020 target using 2005 as the baseline year is 22%. Actual emissions of CO2 from the domestic sector fell by just over 2% between 2005 and 2008 despite an increase in population of 9,100. Per capita emissions of CO2 fell by 3.95%. The Government target relates to actual not per capita emissions. This is similar to the trend nationally and the Government is introducing the Green Deal, changes to Building Regulations and Renewable Energy incentives to accelerate progress to this target.

The Climate Change Strategy is currently being reviewed and workshops with key stakeholders and experts are being planned to assess how the Council can take advantage of new financial incentives and work with partners to increase the energy efficiency of the housing stock and explore the potential for the development of decentralised and renewable energy.
Supplementary Question

If we continue to make progress at the current rate, only 10% of houses will benefit by 2020. What steps will you take to speed up the process and ensure we reach 22% by 2020?

Answer

I have given the answer already. I would also like to add that the green deal was in the Conservative manifesto which is being implemented by Chris Huhne

Question number 21 of 2010 from Councillor Dave Hockey

b) Local residents gain maximum possible advantage from the funding and funding schemes being provided for loft and cavity wall insulation?

Answer

In order to ensure local residents are aware of and able to gain maximum possible advantage from present schemes, a variety of mechanisms are already in place which we are planning to carry forward to the Green Deal, particularly for vulnerable and ‘hard to reach’ residents:-

1) Door to door canvassing by the existing accredited contractor;
2) Advertising in a variety of local media;
3) Individual presentations tailored at a variety of community groups;
4) A joint referral system by a variety of home visitors;
5) Representation in Schools, Libraries, Health Centres, community events and major employers in the area;
6) Visits to householders where excess cold and associated mould and damp problems are affecting their homes;
7) Supporting communities that wish to develop community energy action plans.

Although free and impartial advice is available to all South Gloucestershire residents, the Green Deal will provide a funding stream that is available to all and is not restricted by current grant obligations and means testing.

Supplementary Question

How are you going to involve members in ensuring Green Deal funding

Answer

I have already given the answer, there will be workshops
Question number 22 of 2010 from Councillor Dave Hockey

c) New green jobs are created here in South Gloucestershire to ensure that we have the local capacity to meet these needs and to enable home owners and businesses to switch to, and to benefit from, the use of renewable energy technologies for generating electricity?

Answer

We increasingly work with colleagues from other authorities and agencies across the West of England to tackle employment and skills issues across the whole of the functional economic market area. The West of England Partnership recently produced a report of employment and skills analysis, skills gaps and shortages, key sectors and employability skills. These reports were considered by the South Gloucestershire Economy and Skills Partnership on December 7th 2010 (agenda item 7). In particular, within the context of key sectors the report recognises the skills issues and challenges we must address locally in the Environmental Technologies sector. Also, within the context of employment growth the report talks about the need for new skills, new combinations of skills, and new ways of managing skill inputs.

Work as been done by the Energy Saving Trust to identify the capacity for demand for sustainability measures in the domestic market within South Gloucestershire and the associated level of employment that might generate. The demand itself will be the key driver in technological change and innovation requiring everyone in the supply chain to attain the relevant skills and knowledge.

Colleges provide the vast majority of the resource available for post-19 (and indeed 16-19) skills training in the sub-region. The West of England Partnership have secured formal agreement with all of the colleges to work together. This will enable us to begin a process of joint planning which gives the employer community influence over provision and gives the providers a means of validating what they are delivering against genuine labour market demand. This will be key to the development of skills required for green jobs.

In relation to our work across the West of England to tackle worklessness we have recognised in our action plan an opportunity to develop a green/digital skills and employment proposal. As part of this work Weston College have developed a pilot hub which is focussed on delivering sustainable construction skills. This activity is currently linked to work on social housing in Weston and the plan is to scale up and roll this out further across the West of England if the pilot scheme proves successful.

In addition to the work being developed by the authorities and the colleges we are aware of at least one private sector led proposal (not yet in the public domain) that could see the development of a centre of excellence for skills and product development in environmental technologies which is likely to be based in South Gloucestershire and
an associated development in BaNES that will focus specifically on the development of retro-fit skills and technologies.

**Supplementary Question**

Can you please advise how many green jobs will be created in SGC to meet the 22% homes target.

**Answer**

The Council will be working with key partners and stakeholders to take advantage of financial incentives on offer to meet the targets we all want to reach.

**To the Executive Councillors for Children & Young People and for Planning, Transportation & Strategic Environment**

**Question number 23 of 2010 from Councillor Roger Coales**

What is the council’s response to the government consultation paper “Planning for Schools Development”?

**Answer**

The Government has consulted on proposals to reduce the red tape and bureaucracy associated with the change of use of existing buildings to educational uses, where this would help meet the needs of the community.

Currently planning permission is required in all cases for the change of use of a building to (or from) educational uses. The Government’s consultation proposes a range of options which include allowing a change of use to occur without planning permission over a limited range of uses, through to allowing any building to change to a school, with or without conditions.

The consultation, which ran for an eight week period, expired on 10th December 2010. All members were circulated with a copy of the draft response.

The council’s response indicated a preference for an option that would require conditions relating to safe routes to schools and flood risk to be imposed when it is proposed that buildings change to education use without planning permission.

**Supplementary Question**

Does the Executive Member support planning permission not being required for any change of use on the grounds of reducing red tape and bureaucracy?
Why were members not consulted on the draft reply until the very last day of the 8 week consultation period?

Answer

I do wish to remove red tape wherever possible and will provide a written response to both questions.

To the Executive Councillor for Community Care and Housing

Question number 24 of 2010 from Councillor Geoff King

Is the Executive Councillor aware of the local concern about the early closure of Kerr House, and what assurances can he give residents and their families about the seamless re-provision of appropriate future accommodation?

Answer

Kerr House is in the second phase of the decommissioning programme for our ageing elderly persons care homes. Work has only recently started to establish the needs and future preferences and requirements of current residents. The home will not close prior to all existing residents achieving suitable alternative accommodation and so it is not the case that Kerr House is scheduled for early closure – this will be determined solely with regard to meeting the needs of residents. This has been communicated to the residents, relatives and staff of Kerr House.

A careful and sensitive approach is in place to ensure that residents and relatives have sufficient time and attention to personal circumstances when choosing an alternative home – and I'm pleased to say that a number of residents, including Kerr House residents, are currently considering a move to our new extra care housing developments in Downend and Yate.

We have invested in additional resources to ensure that all residents (and their relatives) have an allocated social worker who is their single point of contact should any concerns arise. This is supported by a Residents Charter which sets down unambiguously the quality standards all residents and relatives can expect and by which the council can be held to account.

An evaluation report on the de-commissioning of the first two homes - drawing upon the experiences of residents and relatives - is nearing completion. Early indications from this report, which will be published in the New Year, suggest that our approach has successfully achieved a smooth transition to alternative living arrangements. With this in mind, I am confident and can give reassurance that our approach in Kerr House can be equally successful in achieving a smooth transition.
**Supplementary Question**

Can you delay the closure timetable to coincide with the opening of new provisions.

**Answer**

We are dealing with the most venerable people. By starting the process earlier it allows residents to plan more but this does not mean closing earlier. The pace of decommissioning is linked to Individual residents so the whole process has to be flexible and people centered.

**Question number 25 of 2010 from Councillor Peter Tyzack**

In light of personalised letters being sent to Merlin residents from opportunistic companies selling boiler breakdown cover, would the Executive member undertake to speak with Merlin to ensure that residents are not conned into taking out unnecessary and costly insurance?

**Answer**

Thank you for drawing this to my attention. I am advised that a liaison meeting with the Merlin senior management team will take place on 21st December and I have asked that the Director take up this issue. I have also asked that I receive a report back on the result of that discussion.

**Supplementary Question**

The lists supplied to contractors should not be used as marketing tools so procedures must be wrong either in Merlin or within the installation company.

**Answer**

I will raise this with Merlin.

**Question number 26 of 2010 from Councillor Peter Tyzack**

And what will the Executive Member do in future to protect South Gloucestershire Council residents, particularly the elderly and vulnerable in social housing, from this sort of sharpy practice?

**Answer**

The department works closely with Trading Standards to identify and address scams, and other risks to vulnerable and older people. Additionally, the department work closely with other organisations to promote awareness of ‘rogue trader’ practices for example,
supporting Age UK’s approved trader scheme. The department also works closely with the Senior Citizens Forum and its Newsletter has been a source of warning and advice to older residents on the risks posed by rogue traders.

An important aspect of such work, and recognised within the department, is that it is not ‘one and done’ but rather requires periodic attention to reflect the ongoing risks posed by unscrupulous individuals with shared intelligence within the council but also across key organisations such as the police, bearing in mind the wider community safety elements of this issue.

The department’s Head of Housing will raise this issue with the social landlord group at its next meeting to address issues specifically related to social housing tenants. Again, I have asked that I receive a report back on the outcome of that discussion.

To the Executive Councillor for Communities

Question number 27 of 2010 from Councillor Pat Rooney

Leading the department responsible for promoting healthy lifestyles, does the Executive Councillor share her MP’s desire to relax the smoking ban, and will she make representations to local MPs on the issue if not?

Answer

The Member of Parliament for Kingswood, Chris Skidmore, is not against a smoking ban, as he believes that the main areas of public houses must be smoke free. Everyone who wishes to eat and drink without the risk of passive smoke must be allowed to do so.

The proposed Bill that Mr Skidmore voted for was to allow landlords to introduce a smoking room, fully equipped with effective extractor fans, and only if the landlord wished to. However, smoking would remain banned in any public house that served food, regardless.

I agree that current legislation should be scrutinised to ensure it is working as effectively as originally envisaged and that there are not unintended consequences.

In terms of promoting healthy lifestyles, ensuring that people take responsibility for their own lives must be the key in achieving this.

Supplementary Question

Employees will be forced to work in smoking areas. Can you please impress this point on Chris Skidmore.
Answer

I have been in correspondence with Chris Skidmore. I am proud of our 98.5% compliance rate and all the work we have undertaken on this project.

Question number 28 of 2010 from Councillor Shirley Potts

How much do our local heritage and museums bring to benefit South Gloucestershire’s community, both financially and in terms of tourism?

Answer

This issue falls within the PT&SE portfolio and so the following answer has been provided by the Executive Member for PT&SE:

During 2008-9, museum volunteers in Gloucestershire and South Gloucestershire gave an estimated 78,000 hours of volunteer labour, which included 5,200 hours spent running heritage events in South Gloucestershire. The time and skills provided for free by museum volunteers equates to a value of over £1 million a year.

During 2008-9, there were 19,771 visitors to South Gloucestershire Museums and another 12,261 visitors attended outreach talks and heritage events. In addition there were approximately 51,000 visitors to the Avon Valley Railway. It is not known how many of these visitors are tourists and how many are local people.

Supplementary Question

I do not believe that the question has been answered. I asked about financial and other benefits. The services of the 2 Heritage officers meant that the Council supported voluntary groups. Will the Council retain this function and how will the gap now be filled.

Answer

We are doing what we can to cover the gap. I have met with the Heritage management committee to discuss the matter.

Question number 29 of 2010 from Councillor Pat Hockey

Background

The Cabinet Office has launched a new £100million Transition Fund to help the charities, voluntary groups and social enterprises that are affected by public spending cuts to make necessary adjustments so that they can continue to play an important part in public service reform and the Big Society Agenda. The Transition Fund will help civil society organisations which deliver high quality public services to be more resilient, agile and able to take opportunities presented by a changing funding environment. The
Office for Civil Society has appointed BIG Fund (non-Lottery funding operation of the Big Lottery Fund) to administer the fund.

I am sure the Exec Member joins us in very much welcoming the announcement of this Fund. Is she aware of any organisations who may qualify and what is she doing to ensure they are in a position to apply?

**Answer**

I also welcome the Government’s announcement of the new Transition Fund, as well as the other initiatives being introduced by the Coalition Government to help the voluntary and community sector, such as the Big Society Bank. I am very aware that the Transition Fund concentrates on supporting voluntary and community sector organisations through change management in response to the changing financial environment and this Council, along with partners, is investing considerable resource in supporting the sector to the same ends.

Historically, the voluntary and community sector has been more dependent on local government funding (in particular) in South Gloucestershire than elsewhere, due to the low level of other statutory sources and the difficulty of proving need to independent sources of funding. A survey carried out by CVS in 2010 showed that locally 67% voluntary and community sector organisations receive funding from South Gloucestershire Council (above the national average) and 22% receive funding from the town & parish councils.

The Chief Officer of CVS South Gloucestershire has consistently complimented the Council on the way on which it has engaged with the community and voluntary sector in considering the impact of a changing funding environment, and has contrasted that with the unilateral termination of funding in some other parts of the country. Ironically, this effective management of the process may mean that local groups do not meet the criteria for support set by the Transition Fund.

**Supplementary Question**

The supplementary question relates to the last paragraph of the answer. Does this mean that you are not aware of any organisations who may qualify or are there groups who should be referred.

**Answer**

Information has been sent out on eligibility for grants. An eligibility checker has been provided and support mechanisms are in place.
Question number 30 of 2010 from Councillor Dave Hockey

What were the main problems with the introduction of the new waste collection system introduced on 22 November?

Answer

1. Inclement weather delayed the delivery of the imported plastic bottle bags at the SITA depot, which in turn meant that some households did not receive them on time – however all have now been provided. A relatively small number of households reported not receiving their receptacles, but actual numbers are low and, where reported, these are being distributed within normal response timescales.

2. There has been a welcome increase in the requests for replacement containers, mainly green recycling boxes and reusable paper storage bags, which suggest some residents’ plan to increase their recycling. In addition, the service changes have stimulated some households to request replacement black bins. Whilst these requests were unforeseen, SITA is responding and meeting delivery requests within accepted and agreed timescales.

3. There were a number of initial enquiries and observations about the change in collection policy, particularly the need to present cardboard for collection separately from the green waste in the green bin. Officers have issued guidance on the way to put out cardboard for collection. This is detailed on the public website under ‘Information and Top Tips’, and is being given out by the Contact Centre. The number of enquiries is reducing, see below.

4. Miscellaneous queries and complaints about missed collections have been received. These are mainly due to the new collection services bedding in as the crews become familiar with the routes. However, the number of missed bins is reducing more quickly than we anticipated, which is a welcome trend.

Supplementary Question

At the Waste Management Forum the waste collection system and collection for cardboard was a key issue. When will the public be given guidance other than through the website on how to place cardboard out for collection without it being blown around.

Answer

We took advice from other Councils when implementing the system. It is a case of allowing the system to bed in and issuing advice through contact centres.

Question number 31 of 2010 from Councillor Dave Hockey

Roughly how many residents were affected by each of these problems?
Answer

1. 60,000 households received temporary plastic bags for plastic bottles with their food waste receptacles until the official plastic bags arrived for delivery.

2. SITA has experienced an unprecedented number of requests for new black / green bins and green boxes. Requests for all receptacles (bins, boxes, kitchen bins and bags) have however dropped steadily from 322 on the 22nd November to 114 on Thursday 9th December.

3. As expected, the Contact Centre received an increase in service requests and queries, and to deal with this increase additional temporary staff were employed. However, the number of requests, enquires and problems raised by residents to the Contact Centre have declined rapidly from 472 on 22nd November to 79 on 9th December.

4. The number of outstanding e mails has also dropped from 187 on Friday 6th December to 4 on Friday the 3rd December.

5. In a normal collection week, we would expect around 130 reports of missed collections. Since the roll-out, the average has been 193 for w/c 22nd November, 183 for w/c 29th November and 174 for w/c 6th December. We would expect this to continue to fall even though there has been a 33 per cent increase in the number of collections.

Supplementary Question

There is an issue relating to 2 residents who were told that the contact centre was busy and could not deal with their problems. What are you going to do to ensure that problems are dealt with.

Answer

Please will you provide the details of these people and I will offer an apology. We have increased collections for over 100,000 houses but have only had 36, 53 and 34 extra complaints in each of the first 3 weeks respectively since introduction.

Question number 32 of 2010 from Councillor Dave Hockey

What action was taken to resolve each of these problems?

Answer

1. The delivery of official plastic bottle bags has now been completed and SITA is responding quickly to supply individual households that may have been missed.
2. SITA has crews continually delivering replacement bins and boxes in the timescale required under the contract.

3. Officers have developed standard responses to enquiries about the new services including cardboard collections. The website has an information and top tips section which clarifies how residents can present their cardboard to minimise littering. We are reminding residents to present cardboard sensibly, which can be in a box or sturdy bag if preferred.

4. A Communications Action Team consisting of Council officers and SITA Managers meets every Monday, Wednesday and Friday evening to review how the new service is performing and to address issues arising and has ensured that the scale and nature of all the problems has been managed and reduced very quickly.

**Question number 33 of 2010 from Councillor Dave Hockey**

Further to the report to the Safer & Stronger Communities Strategic Partnership on 4 December, what are the estimated costs of dealing with crime and antisocial behaviour in each of our priority neighbourhoods?

**Answer**

Councillor Dave Hockey is referring to the interim stage of the annual Joint Strategic Assessment of crime and disorder, which was presented to the Safer & Stronger Communities Strategic Partnership in its role of Community Safety Partnership on 4 December 2010. It is a legal requirement under the Police and Justice Act 2006 that this Strategic Assessment is carried out annually by the latter.

As part of the Strategic Assessment, a methodology published by the Home Office was used to calculate the 'cost of crime' in various parts of South Gloucestershire.

It is important to understand this methodology; its limitations and its benefits, in order to place the figures it produces into context.

The methodology was devised by the Home Office in 2003/04 and costs have not been updated since then.

Using averaged national figures a cost for individual crime types is estimated.

This includes costs to:

- **Individuals** (Security; insurance; value of property damaged or stolen)
- **Private sector** (Lost output through absence from work)
- **Health service** (Dealing with physical and emotional impact)
- **Police and criminal justice system** (Crime investigation; courts; probation; prison)
This is then multiplied by the number of recorded incidents of that crime to estimate the overall cost of that crime. Figures produced using this methodology do not relate to the actual costs of dealing with crimes in a particular area but do provide a valuable means of comparison, taking into account the relative impact of different forms of crime.

The South Gloucestershire Strategic Assessment Councillor Dave Hockey describes covers only the priority crime types of:

- Domestic burglary
- Non-domestic burglary
- Theft of a motor vehicle
- Theft from a motor vehicle
- Robbery
- Violence against the person
- Criminal damage

The following table shows the total number of these crimes between 1st October 2009 and 30th September 2010, and an aggregated cost to the criminal justice system and health service using the methodology described above (i.e. costs to individuals and the private sector have been excluded). It should be noted that Police Beat boundaries do not mirror Priority Neighbourhoods, but provide a pragmatic basis for comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police beat</th>
<th>Number of crimes</th>
<th>Cost of priority crimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yate</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>£1,240,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filton</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>£724,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patchway</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>£853,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staple Hill</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>£977,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingswood</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>£2,095,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkwall (Cadbury Heath)</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>£650,060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supplementary Question**

What steps will you take to ensure that Council is kept informed of issues in Kingswood.

**Answer**

There has been a particular problem in Kingswood because there is no overarching partnership to take ownership.

**Question number 34 of 2010 from Councillor Dave Hockey**

What steps do you believe need to be taken to identify the main causes of the exceptional problems and related costs in Kingswood, bearing in mind the leadership
and investment by Town and Parish Councils in building stronger communities in their areas for all age groups?

Answer

Kingswood is one of the Priority Neighbourhoods agreed by the Council and partners, partly as a result of the comparison of crime figures to other neighbourhoods across South Gloucestershire and England.

Following the meeting of the Safer & Stronger Communities Strategic Partnership on 4 December, officers supporting that partnership have now been tasked with developing plans to respond to the challenges and related costs which result from the level and pattern of crime in Kingswood. The Partnership also agreed that that work should be linked to existing plans for working in Priority Neighbourhoods.

The Cabinet has previously resolved that there is a key role for the community in resolving and delivering some of their own solutions in priority neighbourhoods. Work is being carried out in all priority neighbourhoods to establish groups that will help lead this work at a local level. In a number of the priority neighbourhoods that local leadership role is being taken by Town or Parish Councils; or by Community Partnerships with the support of Town or Parish Councils.

Although there are a number of community and voluntary sector organisations working in Kingswood, there is no overarching organisation which regularly brings these together as the priority neighbourhood Community Lead Groups are anticipated as doing.

A meeting of groups working in Kingswood is being organised for early 2011, with a view to establishing an overarching body to at least play part of this local leadership role.

Question number 35 of 2010 from Councillor Dave Hockey

Why does the newsletter produced by the Community Engagement Team fail to give details of the Council's Area Forums when these are clearly geared to engaging with local communities across each area on a variety of funding, transport and other key local issues?

Answer

The Community Engagement Team produce a number of newsletters. These are aimed at different audiences, and hence inform the intended audience about different issues.

The Rural & Parishes newsletter is prepared and distributed quarterly and articles on the Local Area Forums are included on a regular basis.
Local Area Forum meetings will continue to be advertised in future editions of the Rural & Parishes newsletter.

Supplementary Question

Can you ensure that when the Safer and Stronger community groups are advertised the Area Forums are also advertised.

Answer

Yes, this already takes place but we can do so more frequently if it is required.

Question number 36 of 2010 from Councillor Dave Hockey

Do Area Forums help us to engage with our communities?

Answer

Area Forums are one of a number of ways the Council engages with communities.

61 UPDATE ON STRATEGIC SUB REGIONAL ISSUES (agenda item 9)

Councillor John Calway introduced the item. It was agreed to note the information provided and move to the next item of business.

62 REVIEW OF STATEMENT OF LICENSING POLICY (Agenda item 10)

Having declared a Personal and Prejudicial interest, Councillor Matthew Riddle left the meeting.

Councillor Alan Lawrance thanked Mark Pullin and his team for their work on this issue and proposed the item. Councillor Shirley Potts seconded the item and when put to the vote it was unanimously RESOLVED that:

Council approve the Statement of Licensing Policy as attached at Appendix B to the report in the agenda.

Councillor Matthew Riddle returned to the meeting.

63 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CHAIR OF THE AUDIT AND ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (agenda item 11)

Councillor Howard Gawler proposed, Councillor John Goddard seconded and upon being put to the vote it was unanimously resolved that:
Council approve the Annual Report of the Chair of the Audit and Accounts Committee

64 JOINT LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN 3 (agenda item 13)

The Chair of Council drew attention to the update report on this item.

Councillor Brian Allinson proposed, Councillor Ian Smith seconded and upon being put to the vote it was unanimously resolved that:

1 Council approve the final draft JLTP3.

2 Council delegate authority to the Director of Planning, Transport and the Strategic Environment (PT&SE) in consultation with the Executive Member for PT&SE to make minor amendments or any points of clarification prior to the JLTP3 being formally submitted to Government.

65 MOTIONS (Agenda item 14)

Motion 7 of 2010/11 – Liberal Democrat Motion - Green Dog Walkers Leave only Pawprints.

Councillor Claire Young proposed, Councillor Linda Boon seconded and upon being put to the vote with 1 abstention and all others in favour it was resolved that:

This Council notes that South Gloucestershire Council only has 2 dog wardens to cover the whole area and that those wardens in general work 9am – 5pm hours.

This Council recognises that many dog owners walk their dogs outside of these hours and congratulates the majority who are responsible and conscientious in cleaning up after their pets.

This Council further notes schemes in Scotland that have promoted volunteers as part of a social responsibility network to act as Green dog walkers to tackle dog fouling by the irresponsible or ill prepared few. Ref: Green Dogwalkers Campaign: http://greenvoice.com/greendogwalkers

This Council believes that South Gloucestershire Council would benefit from a similar scheme here and requests the Executive Member for Communities to investigate.

Motion 8 of 2010/11 – Liberal Democrat Motion - Preventing Bike Deaths.

Councillor Pat Hockey proposed, Councillor Neil Halsall seconded and upon being put to the vote with 1 abstention and all others in favour it was resolved that:

This Council notes the Cycling city status of Bristol and South Gloucestershire Councils.
This Council notes that an estimated 100 cyclists are killed on Britain’s roads each year and that a high percentage of deaths involve Lorries despite HGVs being only 3% of vehicles on the roads.

This Council notes the Written Declaration 81 tabled by Fiona Hall which calls on the Commission to revise lorry standards in order to take advantage of new technology to eliminate blind spots.

This Council therefore resolves to email all the SW MEPs to ask them to sign WD 81

Motion 9 of 2010/11 – Liberal Democrat Motion - Community compensation from national infrastructure.

Councillor Peter Tyzack proposed, Councillor Jon Williams seconded and upon being put to the vote it was unanimously resolved that:

This Council believes that local communities should be compensated for hosting national infrastructure.

This Council notes the Toll for the Severn Bridge will rise next year.

This Council also notes that once the cost of the construction of the bridge has been repaid then any profit made on the Tolls will be available to revert to the Treasury.

This Council believes that the cost to the local community in pollution and congestion merits a contribution to the Local authority to provide funding to tackle these local issues.

Therefore this Council will write to the Government to request that if the provision exists under the Localism Bill, a 1% community compensation charge be levied on the Toll and paid to the Council and if the provision is not included in the bill, the Council writes to local MP’s asking them to lobby for its inclusion.

66 URGENT ITEMS (Agenda item 16)

There were no urgent items.

The meeting closed at 10.35 PM

Chair of Council
Appendix 3
Transport Analysis Bristol East Fringe

1. The housing requirement and locations set out in the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy are predominantly based on the RS areas of search with the exception of the 8000 dwellings proposed along the Bristol east fringe. South Gloucestershire Council has primarily based its growth strategy on the principle that there must be a reasonable prospect of providing the necessary infrastructure to support growth.

2. In this respect, the RS based its assumptions to a large part on the Greater Bristol Strategic Transport Study (GBSTS). This comprehensive transport study assessed the current and future strategic transport needs of the West of England region up to 2031 and was completed in 2006. Key to this programme was the development and implementation of a comprehensive rapid transit network – a major element of the delivery of a step change in the quality of public transport in the sub-region designed to support the major growth being proposed at the time.

3. A series of further studies followed the GBSTS. These included the Public Transport Corridor Options Study (Jan 2007), which concluded that the Ashton Vale to Emersons Green Rapid Transit route, which would support growth along the East Fringe should be pursued in advance of other options.

4. However, the route was reliant on the use of the Bristol-Bath Railway Path which was noted as, ‘designated in the Bristol Local Plan as a Greenway, Open Space and a Site of Nature Conservation Interest and as such the status of the route as a wildlife corridor will require sensitive mitigation’ (Corridor Options Short List Report (May 2007 para 3.17).

Following public consultation on the route alignment, the JLTP 2008 Progress Review (para 10.10) reported that, ‘the corridor from Ashton Vale to Emersons Green included consideration of a segregated route alongside the Bristol to Bath railway path, but challenges in successfully addressing implications for the amenity of the existing cycling and pedestrian corridor have resulted in the need to consider a wider range of route options for this corridor. This route will therefore be delivered in two stages, a major scheme bid for the first stage from Ashton Vale to Temple Meads, for submission to the DfT in early 2009 following public consultation in autumn 2008”.

5. The total cost of the Temple Meads – Emers ons Green route was put at £82m, including a 10-12% local contribution. This is set out in the Regional Funding Allocation (RFA) 2 Expressions of Interest (submitted to Government in Oct 2008). However, since that time Central Government funding for transport infrastructure has been curtailed and the RFA bid process has been replaced. Given the physical difficulties of delivering the Temple Meads to Emersons Green Rapid Transit route it was decided to prioritise the North Fringe – Hengrove Package. Bristol City has thus subsequently deleted the the Bristol-Bath Railway path RT alignment option from its Core Strategy. The scheme is thus now outside of any formal bid process to Central Government.

6. Given the cost it would continue to form a ‘major scheme bid’ to Central Government. Given the character and form of the urban area in the East Fringe it would also require significant re-planning of the route, specifically along the A420, (should the Railway Path continue to be considered unfeasible). The next opportunity to deliver a major scheme to serve the east fringe would therefore not now be before the next Comprehensive Spending Review (2014/15), with delivery not possible before 2021.

7. In addition to the Temple Meads – Emers ons Green Rapid Transit route, significant investment in the local highway network, bus infrastructure (possible extension to the RT
through the site) and cycle and walking routes would also be required to deliver the RS east fringe proposals.

8. The primary highway access route in the East Bristol Fringe is the A4174 Ring Road and radial routes the A432, B4465, A420, A4175 and A431. These main routes all suffer from significant traffic congestion in the peak periods, especially at junctions with the Ring Road. There are also traffic-induced Air Quality Action Areas in Staple Hill and Kingswood High Street.

9. The main ongoing development areas in the East Fringe comprise sites already allocated in the South Gloucestershire Local Plan at Emersons Green (i.e. Emerald Park, the Science Park and Emersons Green East). This development will add traffic onto already congested routes and, hence, is funding junction improvements along the Emersons Green section of the Ring Road and a Park and Ride at Emersons Green East. Any further development at windfall sites would need to contribute towards their site-specific transport infrastructure requirements and to strategic transport infrastructure projects including the NFHP (which includes a spur to Emersons Green) and the Ring Road Package.

10. Details on the Ring Road Package are set out in Appendix A of the Transport Section of the IDP Appendices. The Ring Road Package has not specifically been devised to deliver the RS growth proposals, but rather address existing congestion and provide some additional capacity to allow for ‘windfall growth’ over the Core Strategy period. The cost has been estimated to range from a minimum of £14m to some £34m depending upon whether elements are delivered as part of the NFHP and whether the M4 overbridge north of the Wick Wick Roundabout is rebuilt to accommodate a further lane from Yate. The Ring Road Package may be implemented as growth and funding opportunities arise. However, the costs are such that in order to enable the delivery of the extent of housing envisaged by the RSS it is considered that it would need delivery in it entirety. The Ring Road Package would therefore, similarly need some Central Government funding, thereby to be part of a ‘major scheme bid’.

11. Hence, given the constrained public investment scenario over the coming decade and sub-regional growth priorities it is not considered realistic to expect the delivery of the necessary transport infrastructure to support some additional 8000 dwellings on the Bristol East Fringe. This is substantiated by the fact that the development industry is no longer promoting such large scale development.