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1. Introduction

1.1 This statement sets out the consultation and engagement activities that South Gloucestershire Council has undertaken with stakeholders and local communities in preparing its Core Strategy Development Plan Document. The consultation and engagement activities have been undertaken in accordance with Regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008 and 2009 and with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

1.2 The Regulations require the Council to prepare and publish a statement setting out:

a) which bodies and persons were invited to make representations during the preparation of the Core Strategy;

b) how those bodies and persons were invited to make such representations;

c) a summary of the main issues raised by those representations; and

d) how the issues have been addressed in the Core Strategy Pre-Submission Publication document.

1.3 Work on the Core Strategy began in early 2007 and at that time, the Regulations included a Preferred Options stage after Issues and Options. Around the time the Core Strategy was at Issues and Options in 2008, the Regulations were amended to remove the Preferred Options stage. The decision was taken by the Council to carry out further consultation and engagement activities post Issues and Options to further develop the visioning, spatial objectives and place making elements of the emerging Core Strategy, before proceeding to the Publication stage of the Core Strategy.

1.4 The timetable and content of the Core Strategy has been prepared within the context, of, and affected by, delays in the progress of the Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West.

1.5 This statement presents a summary of the activities undertaken, the representations received and the issues raised. More detailed information is contained in a number of specific documents which have been prepared as work on the Core Strategy has progressed, and these are cross-referred in the statement and attached as appendices.
### 2. Consultees

2.1 The Council maintains a Local Development Framework Consultation Database and members of this database were kept informed of progress and opportunities for involvement throughout the preparation of the Core Strategy. The following organisations, groups and individuals were listed in the database:

**Specific Consultees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acton Turville Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkington Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almondsbury Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alveston Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arriva CrossCountry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aust Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylburton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath and North East Somerset Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batheaston Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley Stoke Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Primary Care Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Telecom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable &amp; Wireless Global UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charfield Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlcombe Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Ashton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colerne Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colt Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotswold District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cromhall Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Culture Media &amp; Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Education and Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Environment, Food &amp; Rural Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Constitutional Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Work and Pensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DETR, Airports Policy Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didmarton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodington Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downend and Bromley Heath Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doynton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyrham and Hinton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easynet Telecom Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eon Energyu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Welsh and Scottish Railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallback Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filton Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Great Western</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First In Bristol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher German Pipelines Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest of Dean Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frampton Cotterell Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucestershire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Office for the South West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grittleton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ham and Stone Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanham Abbots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanham Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill Parish Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillesley and Tresham Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM Nuclear Directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Acton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keynsham Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingswood Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Sodbury Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Severn Internal Drainage Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luckington Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnox Electric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangotsfield Rural Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshfield Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands Electricity Plc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Operators Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouthshire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Grid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nettleton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS South West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bristol NHS Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Nibley Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Somerset Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Stoke Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Wiltshire District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Wraxall Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTL Telewest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Electric Plc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Safety Directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Government Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldbury on Severn Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldland Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olveston Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patchway Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilning and Severn Beach Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pucklechurch Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pangeworthy Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockhampton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltford Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seabank Power Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severn Trent Water Plc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siston Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solbury Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sopworth Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gloucestershire PCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Regional Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Regional Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yate Town Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interest/Environmental/Community Groups**

| A.E.K. Boco Football Club | Avon Valley Railway Heritage Trust |
| Age Concern | Avon Wildlife Trust |
| Alexandra Workwear | Avonlea Court |
| Almondsbury Local History Society | B R Rentals |
| Alveston History Society | Bangladesh Association |
| Alveston Parish Plan Group | Bath Preservation Trust |
| Ancient Monuments Society | Bendry Brothers Ltd |
| Armstrong Hall Management Committee | Berkeley Strategy |
| ATLAS | Black Development Agency |
| Avon & Somerset Police | Boots The Chemist |
| Avon & Wiltshire Mental Health Partnership Trust | Boyd Link (Owls) |
| Avon Ambulance Service NHS Trust | Bradley Stoke Community School |
| Avon Archaeological Council | Brimsham Green Secondary School |
| Avon Consortium Traveller Education Service | Bristol & Glos Archaeological Society |
| Avon Co-operative Development Agency | Bristol and Avon Chinese Women’s Group |
| Avon Federation of Women’s Institutes | Bristol Chamber Of Commerce And Industry |
| Avon Fire and Rescue Services | Bristol Civic Society |
| Avon Gardens Trust | Bristol Cultural Development Partnership |
| Avon Industrial Buildings Trust | Bristol Industrial Archaeological Society |
| Avon Local Councils Association | Bristol International Airport |
| Avon Local History Association | Bristol Mind |
| Avon Valley Partnership | Bristol Pubs Group |
Bristol Regional Environmental Records Centre (BRERC)
Bristol Visual & Environmental Group
British Chemical Distributors and Traders Association
British Geological Survey
British Horse Society
British Motorcyclist Federation
British Trust for Conservation Volunteers
British Waterways
British Wind Energy Association
Bromley Heath Neighbourhood Council
BS17 Voluntary Link
Business Link
Business West
Byways and Bridleways Trust
Cadbury Heath History Group
Campaign Against Filton Commercial Airport
Campaign for Dark Skies
Castle Secondary School
Cemex UK
Centrapak Limited
Centre for Ecology and Hydrology
Chase and Kings Forest Community Project
Children and Young People’s Participation Working Group
Chipping Sodbury Cricket Club
Chipping Sodbury Secondary School
Chipping Sodbury Town Trust
Church Commissioners
Churches Council for Industry & Social Responsibility
City Line
City of Bristol (Soundwell) College
Civic Trust
Civil Aviation Authority
Colerne Parish Council
Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment
Commission for Equality and Human Rights
Community Action
Community Recycling Network
Confederation of British Industry
Coniston Community Centre
Connexions West of England
Cotswold Conservation Board (AONB)
Cotswold Way National Trail
Council for the Education of Romany & other Travellers
CPRE
Creda Limited
Crime Concern
Cruse Bereavement Care
CVS South Gloucestershire
Cycle Forum
Cyclebag East
Cyclists Touring Club
Defence Estates
Destination Bristol
Disability Access Advisory Services
Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee
Downend Community Association
Downend Local History Society
Downend Secondary School
Dyrham & Hinton History Group
English Federation of Disability Sport SW
English Golf Union
English Partnerships
English Rural Housing Association
Equal Opportunities Commission
Essilor Limited
Eurotaxis Ltd
Falfield Action Group
Farming and Countryside Education
Federation of Small Businesses
Filton College
Filton High School
Folk House Archaeological Society
Forest of Avon
Forestry Commission
Frampton Cotterell & District Community Association
Frampton Cotterell Conservation Group
Frampton Cotterell Youth Council
Freight Transport Association
Frenchay Preservation Society
Friends Of Cock Road Ridge
Friends of Leap Valley
Friends of Severn Beach Railway
Friends of the Earth
Friends of the Moat
Friends of the Moat
Friends of Winterbourne Medieval Barn
Friends, Families & Travellers
Fusion Online Limited
Garden History Society
Georgian Group
Green Belt Defence Campaign
Gypsy Council for Health, Education and Welfare
Hanham District Green Belt Conservation Society
Hanham High School
Hanham Local History Society
Hanson Aggregates
Hawkesbury Upton Conservation Society
Hawkesbury Vision Project
Health and Safety Executive
Help the Aged
Henbury & Brentry Community Council
History Association
Housing Corporation
Ibstock Brick Limited
Institute of Directors
Inter Route
Irish Travellers Movement in Britain
Joint Cycleway Group
Joint Local Access Forum
King Edmund Community School
Kingsfield Secondary School
Kingswood and District Business Partnership
Kingswood Bus Project
Kingswood Community Association
Kingswood Conservative Association
Kingswood Council for the Disabled
Kingswood Environmental Forum
Kingswood Group of Community Associations
Kingswood Heritage Museum Trust
Kingswood Local History Society
Kingswood Ramblers
Kleeneze Sealtech
Land Access & Recreation Association
Landscape Design Associates
Learning and School Effectiveness Service
Learning and Skills Council
Learning South West
Leisure Travel
LIDL UK
Lincombe Barn Natural History Society
Longwell Green Christian Fellowship
Longwell Green Community Association
Magna Interior Systems
Mangotsfield Community Association
Mangotsfield Secondary School
Mangotsfield Watch Committee
Marine and Fisheries Agency
Marlwood Secondary School
Marshfield & District Local History Society
Marshfield Society
McNicholas
Mead Packaging Limited
Mineral Valuer South Western
Ministry of Defence
Monica Britton Exhibition Hall
Motorcycle Action Group
National Farmers Union
National Gypsy Council
National Playing Fields Association
National Romani Rights Association
National Trust
National Westminster Bank
National Wind Power
New Earth Solutions LTD
Northavon Conservative Association
Northavon Green Party
Northavon Highways Action Group
Oldbury Village History Group
Olveston & Tockington Countryside Group
Olveston History Society
Patchway Community College
Patchway Local History Group
Pedestrian Association
Pilning and Severn Beach Parish Plan Group
Police Community Safety Department
Public Art South West
Pucklechurch Community Association
Pucklechurch Parish Plan Group
Quarry Products Association
Quartet Community Foundation
RAC Motoring Services
Radar
Regen SW
Rexam Medical Packaging
Richards Gray
Ridgewood Community Association
Road Haulage Association
Rockhampton History
Romany Guild
Royal Mail (Bristol)
Royal Yachting Association
RRHT
RSPB
Save Britain's Heritage
Securicor Omega Express
Severn Estuary Partnership
Severn Estuary Strategy
Severn Vale Webpoints
Severnside Branch Railway Development Society
Severn Vale History Research
Showmen's Guild of Great Britain
Sir Bernard Lovell Secondary School
SITA UK
Socialist Environmental Resources
Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings
Society Of Travelling People
Sodbury History Society
Sodbury Vale Family History Group
Sodbury Vale Heritage Museum
South Gloucestershire Asian Project
South Gloucestershire Bus & Coach Company
South Gloucestershire Chinese Association
South Gloucestershire Senior Citizens Forum
South West Planning Aid
Southwold Ramblers
Spandex
Sport England (South West)
St Mary Shopping Centre
Staple Hill Chamber Of Trade
Staple Hill Regeneration Partnership
Sun Life Assurance Plc
Sustainable Thornbury
Sustrans
The Care Forum
The Children's Society
The Clocktower Association
The Environmental Dimension Partnership
The Grange School and Sports College
The Greenfield Charitable Trust
The Mall
The Ramblers Association
The Ridings High School
The Theatres Trust
The Willow Tree Centre
The Woodland Trust
Thornbury & District Heritage Trust

Developers/Landowners/Agents
Adams Homes Associates
Airbus
Alder King
Alliance Planning
Ariva Ltd
ARK Consultancy
Atisreal
Atkins
BAE Aviation Services
BAE Systems
Baker Associates
Barratt Homes

Thornbury Access Group
Thornbury Baptist Church
Thornbury FM
Thornbury Labour Party
Thornbury Liberal Democrats
Thornbury Ramblers
Thornbury Society
Thornbury Society for Archaeology & Local History
Thornbury Town Trust
Thornbury United Reformed Church
Transport 2000
Traveller Law Reform Coalition
Twentieth Century Society
Tytherington Countryside Group
Tytherington History Group
UK Rainwater Harvesting Association
UK Waste Management
University of the Third Age
University of the West of England
Victorian Society
Warmley Community Association
West of England Learning and Skills Council
Westec
Westward Travel
Whitfield Trust
Wick Local History Society
Wickwar Community Association
Winterbourne & District Community Association
Winterbourne Down Society
Woodland Golf and Country Club
Women's National Commissions
Worldwide Fund For Nature
WSPD Energy Forum
Yate Community Association
Yate Youth Council

Barton Willmore
Bloomfields
Bovis Homes
Boyer Planning
BPA Consultants
Bristol Diocesan
Bromford Housing Group
C.S. Properties Ltd
Carter Jonas
CB Richard Ellis
CgMs Consulting
Charles F Jones & Son
Chris Thomas Ltd
Colliers CRE
Country Landowners Association
Crest Nicholson
Crisp Cowley
CSJ Planning
D K Symes Associates
David Ames Associates
David James & Partners
Development Planning Partnership
Diocese of Gloucester
DLP Planning Ltd
DMS Consulting (Town Planning) Ltd
Downend Estates Limited
DPDS Consulting Group
Drewett Neate
DTZ Pieda Consulting
Edward Hardwick and Partners
Edward Ware Homes
Filton Airfield, BAE Systems
Fuiford Land & Planning
Gloucester Diocesan
GVA Grimley
Hartnell Taylor Cook
Heron Land Developments Ltd
Hewlett Packard
Hives Planning Limited
Hoddell Associates
Holt Associates
Home Builders Federation
Humberts
Indigo Planning Ltd
John White & Associates
Levvel Ltd
LPC (Trull) Ltd
Malcolm Scott Consultants
McCarty and Stone
Metropolis Planning and Design LLP
Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
New Futures
Newland Homes
Parkhill Estates Ltd
Peacock & Smith
Pearce Construction
Pegasus Planning
Persimmon Homes
Philip Brown Associates
Philipp Hedges Solicitor
Phillips Planning and Development
Planning Issues Ltd
Planning Potential
PRC Architects
Pro Planning
PTS land
Redcliffe Homes
Redrow Homes
Rolls Royce Military Aero Engines
RPS
Rural Housing Trust
Sarsen Housing Association
Savills
Sellwood Planning
Severnside Distribution Ltd
SF Planning
Shortwood Green Belt Campaign
Slough Estates
Solon Housing Association
Somer Community Housing Trust
Sovereign Housing Association
Spectrum Housing Group
Stewart Ross Associates
Strategic Land Partnership
Stride Treglown
Strutt and Parker
Stuart Larkin & Associates
Sustainable Property Consultants
Terence O’Rourke
Tetlow King Planning
The Bell Cornwell Partnership
The Crown Estate
The Planning Bureau Ltd
Tortworth Estate Co
Turley Associates
United Housing Association
Veale Wasbrough
Weatherall Green & Smith
White Young Green
Williamson Associates Limited
Willis & Co
Wimpey Homes
WS Atkins

**Individuals**

Adams, Mr
Allinson, B
Andrews, L
Angell, B
Banks, R J
Baum, M

Beecher, S
Begley, A I
Berry, R MP
Bendry, R
Bowering, W E
Brady, R

Britton, D
Britton, Mr
Brown, P
Buckoke, A
Burton, R
Church, M J
| Concannon, M | Hall, C | Parsons, A |
| Cook, S | Harding, M | Pease, E W |
| Cook, S | Harford, G | Pernin, B |
| Cox, Y | Hartnell, J | Phillips, R |
| Crocker, A | Helps, M W | Pirie, M |
| Cross, L | Hewish, Mr | Pople, S |
| Crowe, E K | Hidson, R | Porteous, D |
| Cullimore, A W | Higgins, W | Porteous, E |
| Daniells, A | Hill, A | Povey, A |
| Davidge, T L | Hobbs, R D | Priest, A D |
| Dearden, O | Hodson, E W | Pritchard, R |
| Didcot, A | Holloway, S | Probert, B J |
| Dove, I | Howard, Mr | Purchase, S |
| Drain, S | Hume, A | Riddle, M |
| Duckworth, J | Hutchinson, I | Ross, M |
| Dye, K | Iles, R | Scolding, E |
| Edgar, J | Jacobs, P | Selman, J |
| Edwards, S | Johnson, B | Seymour-Williams, J |
| Eggbeer, D | Jones Mr | Simpson, C |
| Elliot, R S | Keller, N | Sims, S |
| England, A D | Keller, P | Smith, G |
| England, T | Killearn, Lord | Soper, S |
| Evans, R | Lawrence, J | Spratt, R J |
| Fear, M | Legg, Mr | Stephens, M |
| Firkins, S | Leppier, T | Stephens, M |
| Flook, W | Lloyd, R | Studley, E |
| Gardner, P E | Maggs, Mr & Mrs | Tanner, S |
| Gearing, C | Makepeace, Mr | Thompson, D |
| Gill, J | Matthews, D | Trotman, P |
| Golledge, S | Mayer, B | Tuck, H R |
| Gooding, R | McCarthy, J | Varney, H M |
| Gradwell, P M | Mealing, Mr | Vaughan, A |
| Grant, S | Murdoch, A | Waterstone, D |
| Greenhalgh, R | Naysmith, D MP | Western, D |
| Greenslade, S K | Nelson, G | Webb, S MP |
| Gynyer, Mr | Nichols, P | Williams, P |
|          | Parr, K | Williams-Lock, C |
3. Consultation methods used

3.1 A wide range of methods and techniques were used to involve, consult, notify and inform people during the preparation of the Core Strategy. This has fully accorded with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008 and 2009 and with the Council’s adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

3.2 In addition to letters, emails, website publicity and newspaper articles and notices, methods of engagement have included public exhibitions, community based workshops, topic based stakeholder workshops, meetings with specific groups and organisations, briefing events and questionnaires. The Council also regularly presented and discussed the emerging Core Strategy with the South Gloucestershire Local Strategic Partnership.

3.3 The Council also ‘joined-up’ Core Strategy consultations with events run by external organisations or other Council services and departments, in order to reduce ‘consultation fatigue’ and to ensure that engagement was appropriately targeted to the particular audience.
Stage 1: Pre-issues and Options

3.4 The purposes of the Stage 1 engagement were:

- to focus on key service providers and stakeholders and examine the principal issues affecting South Gloucestershire and the possible options available;
- to develop links between the Core Strategy and the Sustainable Community Strategy;
- to meet the requirements of South Gloucestershire Council’s Statement of Community Involvement, and
- to raise awareness with the public of the forthcoming Core Strategy and of their role in the process.

3.5 Between March 2007 and February 2008 the Council undertook the following consultation and engagement activities:

- South Gloucestershire Council inter-departmental officer workshop
- Residents’ Questionnaire
- South Gloucestershire Viewpoint Survey
- Initial letter to every organisation/person on the Council’s Local Development Framework Consultation Database
- Meetings with developers/agents of strategic development locations.
- Meetings with adjoining and nearby local authorities
- South Gloucestershire Members and Parish/Town Council Workshop
- Key Stakeholder Workshop
- South Gloucestershire Community Strategy and Core Strategy Workshop
- Presentations/briefing notes/questionnaires to specialist/interest groups.

3.6 The Pre-Issues and Options Engagement Statement in Appendix 1 sets out in detail the consultation and engagement activities identified above.

3.7 A total of 1,748 questionnaires were completed and returned for the Residents’ Questionnaire/Viewpoint Survey. The analysis of the questionnaires and the notes from the workshops are included within the appendices to the Pre-Issues and Options Engagement Statement.
Stage 2: Issues and Options

3.8 During the period Friday 2\textsuperscript{nd} May to Friday 11\textsuperscript{th} July 2008 the Council published the Core Strategy "Issues and Options for consultation" document. This document set out ideas about the issues and challenges facing South Gloucestershire, together with proposed ways that the Core Strategy could address them. This included work to develop 'visions' for different areas of South Gloucestershire and options for the spatial distribution of development. An Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report was published alongside the Issues and Options for consultation also.

3.9 In undertaking the Issues and Options consultation, the Council identified the following four key engagement objectives:

- to fulfil the requirements of national planning policy in respect of early engagement with the wider community;
- to accord with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement;
- to engage as widely as possible with those groups identified as 'hard to reach' groups; and
- to ensure that the wider community of South Gloucestershire was made aware as far as possible of the Council's strong objections to the Regional Spatial Strategy's proposals for future growth in the area and the impact that this level of growth would have on local communities.

3.10 The following consultation was undertaken:

- advance notification of the consultation in late March/April through a press release, letters/emails to all parish and town councils, public sector agencies, community and voluntary organisations in the Council's Compact partnership, emails to libraries and a verbal report to the Parish Charter meeting
- copies of the document were made available for inspection at local libraries and at the Council's One Stop Shops
- a copy was made available online on the Council's website and as an e-consult document with questions on the Council’s e-consult iNovem website
- a consultation notice/advert was placed in the local press to advertise the consultation
- every organisation/person on the Council's Local Development Framework Consultation Database was notified of the consultation by letter/email. Selected consultation bodies and all parish and town councils also received complimentary copies of the documents
- a Question Response Booklet was available with the consultation documents and on the Council's website
- posters were sent to all parish and town councils, South Gloucestershire Council offices, leisure centres, sports centres and youth clubs and Merlin area housing offices to display on their public notice boards
- posters were displayed in shop windows/public notice boards in the areas near to identified options for growth - communities in the East Fringe of Bristol, Henbury/Brenty, Yate/Chipping Sodbury and Thornbury
- publicity material was displayed in the Council's One Stop Shop in Thornbury
- a plain guide leaflet on the Issues and Options document and the consultation was available to take away from libraries, One Stop Shops and exhibitions
• an email advising of the consultation was sent to major employers on the North Fringe Travel Forum
• an article was included in the South Gloucestershire Care Forum newsletter advising of the consultation
• verbal reports to the Council’s Safer and Stronger Meetings advising of the consultation
• letters/emails were sent to every Member of South Gloucestershire Council and the Chief Officer Management Team

3.11 The following engagement activities were also undertaken as part of the consultation process:

• 4 manned public exhibitions to promote the Issues and Options material were arranged at venues and times to enable wide attendance (i.e. geographically dispersed and covering both day and evening sessions) at Thornbury, Bradley Stoke, Emerson’s Green and Chipping Sodbury
• 4 stakeholder workshops at the same venues as the public exhibitions, with each workshop covering a different spatial area
• a workshop for the Local Strategic Partnership/Strategic Partnerships and Councillors was held
• a Council interdepartmental officer briefing was held

3.12 Full details of all the consultation and engagement activities are set out in the Core Strategy Issues and Options Document – Engagement Statement in Appendix 2.

3.13 About 1,300 responses were received to the Issues and Options consultation (although a further 600 letters were received which had been copied to the Leader of the Council, but these are discounted from the total figure as they were duplicates of representations sent direct to the Spatial Planning Team).

3.14 Of the 1,300 representations, 300 were returned copies of the Question Response Booklet, or answers to the booklet questions entered through the Council’s iNovem e-consult webpage, with the remainder being letters and emails many of which structured their responses on the questions in the booklet. A high percentage of the responses were from residents of South Gloucestershire, but responses were also received from Parish and Town Councils, political groups, agents and developers, other business interests, specific (statutory) consultation bodies and non-statutory interest groups. A summary of the responses is set out in the Summary of Responses to Issues & Options Consultation Document in Appendix 3.
Stage 3: Post Issues and Options

3.15 Following the engagement activities organised as part of the consultation on the Issues and Options document, the Council has continued to engage with the wider community, particularly focusing on seeking the views of young people, key stakeholders and community representatives in relation to further developing the visioning, spatial objectives, and place making elements of the emerging Core Strategy. This ongoing engagement accords with Planning Policy Statement 12, the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008 and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.

3.16 The following engagement activities were undertaken between June 2008 and March 2010:

- a consultation event to present and discuss Core Strategy issues with members of the Council for Voluntary Service (CVS) and the Care Forum South Gloucestershire
- 2 South Gloucestershire Youth Summits involved 12-14 years olds looking at what they liked and disliked about their local area and the kind of places, services and facilities they would need in adult life
- a South Gloucestershire Partnership Conference looking at sustainable communities and growth through partnership working
- a presentation on the Core Strategy to a Bitton Village Residents Association meeting
- a briefing and awareness raising event with Town and Parish Councils
- a Local Strategic Partnership meeting to provide an update on the Core Strategy, the Regional Spatial Strategy and the importance of ensuring that infrastructure to support sustainable development is effectively delivered through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
- a Children and Young People – Use Your Voice event to discuss the Core Strategy
- a Thornbury workshop and exhibition to discuss a draft vision and possible options for future residential development, followed by informal consultation on the Council’s website
- 2 community visioning workshops/exhibitions to discuss a draft vision and strategic objectives for Yate/Chipping Sodbury and the best performing spatial areas to meet these objectives
- North Fringe of Bristol community visioning workshops considered the vision for the communities in this area and how it could be best realised
- an Extra Care Housing event was held to determine the views of private sector providers on developing extra care housing in South Gloucestershire
- an Environment Partnership Strategic Green Infrastructure (GI) event to discuss and comment on the emerging policy proposals for GI in the Core Strategy and to consider future GI opportunities
- an open space, sport and recreation consultation event to consider current provision and issues, to identify priorities for the future and how joint working can create better outcomes.

3.17 Full details of these engagement activities are set out in the appendices. The CVS and Care Forum meeting, the first Youth Summit, the Partnership Conference and the Bitton Residents Association meeting are in the Core Strategy Issues and Options Document – Engagement Statement in Appendix 2. The other activities
are set out in the **Post Issues and Options Engagement Statement** in Appendix 4. Notes of the comments made at the various events are set out in the appendices to the two reports referred to above.

**South Gloucestershire Council Member involvement**

3.18  South Gloucestershire Council elected members were closely involved in the preparation of the Core Strategy in the following ways:

a) Planning Advisory Group met regularly to review the emerging draft Core Strategy.

b) a Renewable & Low Carbon Energy Briefing was held with District, Parish and Town Councillors to present the initial findings of a Renewable & Low Carbon Energy Potential study for discussion and views prior to finalisation of the report.

c) a Core Strategy Rural Areas Members Steering Group met on four occasions to discuss rural issues and the appropriate approach to take on rural policy in the emerging draft Core Strategy.
4. Summary of the main issues raised

4.1 This section provides a brief summary of the main issues raised during consultation and engagement. More details are set out in the reports attached in Appendices 1 – 4.

4.2 The Core Strategy has been prepared within the context of the Regional Spatial Strategy and the local communities’ clear and very strong opposition to the levels of growth being proposed by the Regional Spatial Strategy and to the loss of Green Belt land. This has strongly influenced the various stages of the Core Strategy’s development.

Stage 1: Pre-Issues and Options

General Comments

Delivering Growth
- Need multi-functioning communities
- New developments need to benefit existing communities
- Need to include development in smaller settlements not just urban fringe
- Concern that villages on urban fringe retain their character and local distinctiveness and do not get swallowed up by urban extensions
- Local requirements of market towns etc should not be ignored. Important to appreciate role and function of Yate and Thornbury and villages.
- Maintaining the Green Belt is important. Don’t support losing Green Belt for increased housing provision

Housing
- Concern about impact of urban intensification on character, the environment and wellbeing of residents
- Shortage of starter homes
- Need to better provide for an ageing population
- Shortage of affordable housing across South Gloucestershire

Economy
- Existing employment land and employers need to be protected
- The existing employment base needs broadening
- Need better links between housing and employment areas
- Problem of declining town centres - a better mix of uses needed

Transport
- Traffic and congestion is a real issue in many parts of South Gloucestershire
- Poor public transport provision
- Need to improve safety in walking and cycling
- Need to provide more alternatives to the car
- Better integration between modes of transport required

Climate Change
- Core Strategy should include mechanisms/objectives relating to climate change
- Avoid building on areas at risk of flooding
• Efficient public transport infrastructure will reduce CO2 emissions.
• More compact development will reduce the need to travel
• Protect the existing green spaces and make provision for more green spaces
• Plan for allotments to encourage local food production
• Protect agricultural land

Design
• Design and urban design important to the built environment and to health and wellbeing
• Recognise the distinctiveness of different areas
• Improve energy efficiency in new development
• Increase use of renewable energy and require use of combined heat and power in new development areas

Open Space, Sport and Recreation
• Increase participation in activity to reduce health problems
• Important to retain green spaces, particularly in urban areas where they are under threat
• Look at Green Infrastructure in a holistic way
• Increase play provision for younger and older children

Community Facilities
• Uneven distribution of facilities and shortfalls
• Community facilities are important for meeting and socialising

Area specific comments

North Fringe of Bristol
• Traffic congestion
• The environment and open space needs improving
• Need a better balance between homes and jobs
• Lack of distinctiveness

M32 Urban Extension
• Urban extension should be housing focused
• Care needed not to damage green gateway to Bristol
• Need to establish capacity of area early
• New infrastructure needed
• Need to minimise perpetuation of community severance

Cribbs Causeway
• Need to establish appropriate development mix for this area
• Opportunity for better integration with Bristol
• Opportunity for creating better sense of identity and place for Cribbs Causeway
• Phasing and delivery issues need to be worked out.
• Runway safeguarding and exclusion zones around oil and gas pipelines could significantly impact on development potential of area

East Fringe of Bristol
• Area not benefiting so much in economic/social terms as other areas
• Town centres need supporting
• Traffic and congestion a problem
• Improvements to transport infrastructure needed
• State of the environment a concern
- Deficiency of green infrastructure within the urban area
  **East of Kingswood Urban Extension**
  - Strong, local opposition, particularly in the villages, to expansion of the urban area proposed by the RSS
  - Area has landscape and recreational value
  - Flooding issues
  - Transport infrastructure inadequate
  - Ring Road will make integration between new and existing communities difficult

**Yate & Chipping Sodbury**
- Need to change the negative perception of Yate
- Poor public transport and linkages within towns and with Bristol
- The employment base is too narrow
- High level of out-commuting
- Social and health issues
- Spare capacity in primary and secondary schools
- Insufficient range of facilities
- Chipping Sodbury needs a stronger identity and role

**Thornbury**
- Market town serving surrounding villages
- Poor public transport and dependency on the car
- High level of in and out commuting
- Support for some development
- Shortage of affordable housing and small dwellings for younger and older people
- Need a joined-up approach between further housing, employment and public transport

**Rural Areas**
- Most villages function as dormitories and community identity varies
- Decline in facilities and falling school roles
- Need to protect existing employment and services
- Shortage of affordable housing and smaller dwellings
- Scale of new development should be in proportion to size of village to protect character
- Limited facilities for younger and older people
**Stage 2: Issues and Options**

4.3 A significant proportion of comments received were to the level of growth proposed in the Regional Spatial Strategy for South Gloucestershire, to the consequent loss of Green Belt and to the locational options for growth, with the remaining comments spread out across the other aspects of the Issues and Options document.

**Scale of Growth**
- Broad opinion that the scale of growth proposed over the next 20 years is too high
- Strong opposition to loss of Green Belt

**Housing**
- Support for a flexible approach to housing density
- Significant support for a policy to restrict urban intensification to protect the character and amenity of an area
- General recognition that additional affordable housing needs to be provided across South Gloucestershire

**Employment**
- Support for continuing with a policy of safeguarding employment sites

**Design and Renewable Energy**
- Strong support for sustainable construction and achieving the higher BREEAM standards and/or Code for Sustainable Homes levels
- Support for renewable energy generation to help secure more sustainable development but no consensus about how best to deliver it.

**Open Space, Sport and Recreation**
- Significant support for local open space and recreation standards to be set
- General opinion that there is a shortage of recreational facilities for children and teenagers
- Support for improved Green Infrastructure provision
- Recognition of need to improve opportunities for physical activity for health and wellbeing benefits

**Environment**
- Avoid flood risks by developing away from areas of high flood risk, reducing surface water run-off and employing sustainable construction techniques
- Strong support for protecting the environment

**North Fringe of Bristol**
- Shortfall of green space in the area
- Strong support for not identifying further employment land and for a better balance between jobs and homes
- Strong support for better use of public transport, walking and cycling
- Little objection to developing East of Harry Stoke, and a slight preference for developing the smaller of the two areas
- Preference for developing the smaller area at Cribbs Causeway, but concerns about both options
East Fringe of Bristol
- Substantial opposition to an urban extension east of Kingswood proposed by the RSS due to the loss of Green Belt, loss of countryside, impact on existing communities and environmental and physical constraints
- Area needs more jobs and better access to jobs
- Investment needed in town and local centres
- People need to be encouraged back into the traditional town centres to support them
- Support for a restriction on the expansion of Longwell Green Retail Park
- Poor public transport network and service
- Limited amount of green space within the urban area and poor linkages to the countryside

Yate and Chipping Sodbury
- Provision of more jobs to reduce out commuting
- Improvements to evening entertainment and shopping facilities in Yate
- Support for a greater range of independent shops in Chipping Sodbury and better use being made of the High Street
- Substantial opposition to growth option 2 as it includes land east of St John’s Way, Chipping Sodbury, due to impact on the AONB and flood risk
- Strong support for a turn back facility at Yate Railway Station and improved public transport

Thornbury
- Support for further housing in Thornbury, but no consensus on amount or location
- Support for more jobs to reduce out-commuting
- Support for improved public transport
- Shortage of starter homes, extra care and affordable housing
- Town centre needs more facilities
- Town centre needs support of a range of facilities elsewhere in Thornbury

Rural Areas
- Significant support for some further housing in villages
- Important to retain village and rural character
Stage 3: Post Issues and Options

4.4 Engagement post Issues and Options was predominantly focused on the proposed areas for future development, but also included some topic specific engagement. The following pages set out the issues raised at the various workshops and events that were held. More details are set out in the report at Appendix 4 and in the Sustainability Appraisal to the Core Strategy.

North Fringe of Bristol

4.5 The workshops identified areas in the North Fringe with potential for change, discussed the strengths and weaknesses of the area, looked at a new neighbourhood at Cribbs/Pathway and discussed the emerging vision for the area.

Potential Areas/Opportunities for Change

- Older industrial areas (e.g. Patchway Trading Estate & area around The Mall) – intensification/diversification/new housing
- Land south of the Airfield
- UWE & Land East of Coldharbour Lane
- Land west of A4018
- Abbey Wood Retail Park
- M32 Area of Search
- B&Q & Sainsburys
- Rolls Royce East Works
- Frenchay Hospital
- Road Corridors

Weaknesses

- Traffic congestion / commuting
- Insular campus style developments (e.g. AXA,MoD,UWE etc)
- Lack of identity
- Lack of local facilities and distinct centres
- Poor public realm
- Very poor walking routes to stations
- Poor bus services

Cribbs/Patchway area

- Traffic issues
- Issues in maintaining/sustaining the community
- Need to integrate new communities with existing communities
- Opportunity for a better range and integration of uses at The Mall
- Significant existing barriers to pedestrian movement in the area
- Rebalancing of existing communities should precede creation of new communities

Vision

- Support recognition of area as major economic driver
- Vision should focus on jobs rather than employment sectors
- Vision should be more positive about providing better public transport and express high design aspirations for the new neighbourhoods
- Emphasise green space and enhancing or creating ‘identity’
Yate and Chipping Sodbury

4.6 The first workshop reviewed the results of the Issues and Options consultation, considered the needs of the existing community and how the community needed to change and improve.

- Need to ‘sell’ Yate more and overcome its poor image
- Yate lacks evening economy and cultural facilities
- Yate Town Centre not ‘inviting’
- Improve retail offer and complementary roles of Yate and Chipping Sodbury
- Recognise separate identities and distinctiveness of Yate and Chipping Sodbury
- Better public transport needed within the towns
- Traffic congestion caused by out and in-commuting
- Deliver new growth in step with infrastructure
- Integrate employment and housing, unlike present zoning
- Mismatch between skills and jobs
- Low profile of existing schools
- Reinforce and expand cycleway and footpath connections
- Recognise importance of connecting development to green space
- Improve pitch provision/extend YOSC

4.7 The second workshop considered which of the spatial areas around the settlements performed best in achieving the emerging vision and strategic objectives for the towns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location – Land at Engine Common</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Close to train station, but limited access to other public transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of sites of local conservation importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to the Frome Valley walkway and countryside is good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engine Common is established village separate to Yate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engine Common has some existing facilities in North Road. Site not large enough to provide on-site facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No public open space in vicinity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Railway is seen as the divide between Yate and Engine Common communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Easy access to jobs but local employment opportunities low paid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Junction works needed on North Rd etc. Small scale development couldn’t provide this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The area floods. Waste water/sewage services inadequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coal mine shafts and associated tunnelling throughout the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Could help support existing local community facilities and create a village heart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Good hedges and trees and small field sizes give character and encourage small scale development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rural nature and character of location + severance created by railway line limit development opportunities and effective integration with existing fabric of Yate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access is a constraint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Size and scale of development would limit opportunity to provide range of renewable/ decentralised energy measures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location – Land at North Brimsham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Need to link Peg Hill and North Brimsham to get comprehensive development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access – need to improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Issues of flooding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Pylons – health and visual issues  
• Distance to Yate Centre  
• Needs some employment/small business opportunities  
• Recreation opportunities at Yate outdoor sports, existing footpaths and Brimsham Fields  
• Would need bus and cycle links.  
• Capacity of surrounding road network an issue  
• Need to restrict access to Tanhouse Lane to preserve its character.  
• Would need to provide facilities on-site  
• Opportunity to afford ‘protection’ to Yate Rocks and Peg Hill corridor and ridgeline which creates setting for Yate/ Chipping Sodbury.  
• Opportunity to provide range of renewable/ decentralised energy measures.

**Location – Land at Peg Hill**

• Proximity to quarry an issue  
• Poor access to facilities and reduced access to retail  
• Poor access to employment opportunities  
• On-site services and facilities and housing mix limited given site size.  
• No existing bus routes near  
• Existing footpath access through woods to Chipping Sodbury  
• Need to defend the scarp slope visually and protect Yate Rocks  
• Flood risk issue.  
• Needs to be looked at in conjunction with North Brimsham as part of a comprehensive development

**Location – Land at Barnhill Quarry**

• Close to Chipping Sodbury Town Centre  
• Walking distance into town and to Stub Ridings and Ridge Wood.  
• Good access to leisure/ recreation/ retail and primary school  
• Impact on Ridge Wood - area of local conservation and potential SSSI  
• Little impact from Quarry operations  
• Good footpaths and cycle ways  
• Well located to make use of bus routes serving Chipping Sodbury  
• Site too small for use of renewable energy on a large scale - could look at geothermal  
• Common land and flooding issues.  
• Poorer access to main employment area in west Yate

**Location – Land East of Chipping Sodbury**

• Poor access to existing employment  
• Starts to join Chipping Sodbury to Old Sodbury.  
• River Frome goes all the way round the site. Flooding issue  
• Prominent site.  
• No public transport to serve residents  
• Poor access for all traffic  
• Sustainable transport links would need to be improved  
• Development would be disproportionate to the scale of Chipping Sodbury.  
• Proximity and impact on AONB/Commons  
• Larger size of development allows for heating by biomass fuel.
**Thornbury**

4.8 The workshop/exhibition and web consultation considered the emerging vision and the options for further housing in the town.

**Vision**
- Vision should be more aspirational
- Improve the retail offer and facilities in the town centre
- Improve facilities at Thornbury Hospital
- Recognise aspirations of Castle School
- Improve public transport
- Protect Thornbury's historic character
- Broaden employment base and improve occupancy levels
- Provide range of housing types
- Minimise flood risk

**Further housing**
- General support for some housing growth in Thornbury
- Support for not locating in the Green Belt or crossing Morton Way
- To benefit the town centre, development needs to be close

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Option 1 Location – Upper Morton</strong></th>
<th><strong>Option 2 Location – Morton Way</strong></th>
<th><strong>Option 3 Location – Morton Way/Grovesend Road</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Large enough to provide range of housing.</td>
<td>• No impact on town’s historic character.</td>
<td>• Large enough to provide range of housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No impact on town’s historic character.</td>
<td>• Good access to Oldbury Power Station development (as housing for employees).</td>
<td>• No impact on town’s historic character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Good access to Oldbury Power Station development (as housing for employees).</td>
<td>• Not Green Belt</td>
<td>• Large enough to provide range of housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not Green Belt</td>
<td>• Not Green Belt</td>
<td>• No impact on town’s historic character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More car usage as lack of facilities within walking distance.</td>
<td>• More car usage as lack of facilities within walking distance.</td>
<td>• More car usage as lack of facilities within walking distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Far from the town centre</td>
<td>• Far from the town centre</td>
<td>• Impact on nature conservation interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Breaches Morton Way ‘boundary’.</td>
<td>• Breaches Morton Way ‘boundary’.</td>
<td>• Far from the town centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Loss of farmland views from existing dwellings/landscape impact</td>
<td>• Loss of farmland views from existing dwellings/landscape impact</td>
<td>• Loss of green setting to Thornbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Breaches Morton Way ‘boundary’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of farmland views from existing dwellings/landscape impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4 Location – Bristol Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Close to town centre – use for older persons housing</td>
<td>• Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Walking &amp; cycling distance to town centre</td>
<td>• Possible flooding issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of the attractive views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Possible access problems at the junction with Bristol Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Small site – limited housing range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 5 Location – West of Town Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Close to town centre – use for older persons housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Walking &amp; cycling distance to town centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 6 Location – Park Farm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Close to existing schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Closer to town centre than other options - walking and cycling possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential to help enable Castle School realise its aspirations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rural Areas

4.9 The following comments are a summary of the discussions of the Core Strategy Rural Areas Members Steering Group

- Undertake further engagement with communities and additional environmental assessments to determine where development should go
- Undertake engagement on allocating Affordable Housing Only Sites
- Safeguard rural employment sites
- Encourage working from home
- Recognise importance of the countryside and its contribution to the economy, biodiversity, heritage, landscape quality, recreation, tourism and production of local food.
- Support demand responsive and community transport
- Provision of park and ride at Nibley and park and share at Falfield (M5J14) and Tormarton (M4J18).
- Provision of rural transport interchanges.
- Investigate the reopening of Charfield Station.

4.10 The following comments relate to the developing Green Infrastructure Objectives and Open Space Standards policies and to the developing set of Open Space Standards presented at the Environment Partnership Strategic Green Infrastructure event

**Green Infrastructure Objectives**

- Clarify whether policy applies to existing and new communities
- Include “quality of life” phrase
- Recognise access role of GI assets
- Recognise importance of informal recreation and natural play
- Include blue infrastructure
- Clarify “ongoing management and maintenance”
- Clarify statement relating to local food cultivation
- Include protection for best agricultural land
- Delivery should be integral to policy
- Include health promotion benefits in GI objectives
- Policy needs to be stronger on protecting existing assets

**Open Space Standards**

- Policy should allow for both management schemes and commuted sums
- Method of calculation should be available
- Question whether standards take account of private land
- Standards seem unreasonable. More detail needed on their background.
- Further consultation should be undertaken before they are included in the Core Strategy
- Option of delivery off-site should be open to developer as well as Council
- Unclear whether any site size thresholds will apply
- Policy appears to be seeking to rectify known shortfalls by penalising new development.
5. How the issues have been addressed

5.1 How the issues raised at the various stages of engagement and consultation have been addressed in the Core Strategy is set out in the Consultation Statement for Pre-Submission Draft in Appendix 5.