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1.0 Introduction

1.1 A key feature of the planning system is that local planning authorities in preparing their portfolio of Local Development Framework (LDF) documents involve the community early in their preparation and continue to do so during the plan preparation.

1.2 South Gloucestershire Council is producing a Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) to guide strategic development in the district up to 2026. Work began on preparing the Core Strategy in 2007. Public consultation on the Core Strategy Issues & Options ran from May to July 2008. This document reflected the proposals that were emerging at the time out of the regional planning process and was an opportunity for the Council to make our communities aware of what was being put forward and ensure they were able to get involved and make their comments known. Approximately 1,900 responses were received as part of the Issues & Options consultation. A report containing summaries of those responses is available separately.

1.3 The 2004 Town & Country Planning Act encourages ongoing community involvement in the preparation of Development Plan Documents. This is expressed in the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (available separately). The Council has therefore continued to engage with the wider community by conducting further consultation activities in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 12 and Regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008.

1.4 Community engagement activities undertaken included two South Gloucestershire Youth Summits; exhibitions and community led workshops in Yate/Chipping Sodbury, the North Fringe of Bristol and Thornbury. In addition topic based workshops and briefing events for Town and Parish Councils and other key stakeholders were organised. Resources and efforts were particularly focused 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. The feedback from these exercises and events, together with responses from Issues & Options consultation, was used to inform the production of the Pre-Submission Publication Draft Core Strategy.

1.5 Many of the engagement events that have been undertaken have not been formal planning consultation events. Instead, as outlined in the SCI, the Council has sought to ‘join-up’ Core Strategy consultations with events ran by external organisations or other Council services or departments. The purpose of this was to reduce ‘consultation fatigue’ and to ensure that each engagement event was best suited to the particular audience.

1.6 Due to this engagement ‘piggy-backing’ some of the event notes presented in this report have been written and presented by those other groups that were responsible for organising them. This has ensured that the minutes and notes recorded represent as accurately as possible the diversity of comments made at the events.

1.7 The information provided in this report represents a factual record of comments made at stakeholder engagement events. Detailed assessments of the suitability of locations for development are addressed in the Sustainability Appraisal Report that

---

1 This Engagement Statement reflects the RSS position in the period 2008 to March 2010.
accompanies the Core Strategy (available separately). Stakeholders who attended individual events were provided with minutes/feedback at the time each event was undertaken. Details were also made available on our website where appropriate.

1.8 This engagement statement outlines the main consultation activities undertaken since Issues & Options, with more specific details, including results, for each activity contained in the appendices. Separate reports are available that detail the results of previous consultations. A report that summarises how these consultation results have been taken into account in drafting the Draft Core Strategy is also available separately.
2.0 Consultation and engagement undertaken post Issues & Options consultation and prior to the publication of the Pre-Submission Publication Draft Core Strategy (July 2008 - March 2010)

2.1 The following Core Strategy consultation and engagement events and activities were conducted, either by South Gloucestershire Council or in partnership with other organisations.

1. South Gloucestershire Youth Summits, November 2008 and November 2009
2. South Gloucestershire Partnership Conference, February 2009
3. Bitton Residents Association meeting, April 2009
4. Town and Parish Council briefing event, Greenfield Centre, February 2009
5. Local Strategic Partnership meeting September 2009
6. Children and Young People – Use Your Voice event, October 2009
7. Thornbury workshop, exhibition and informal web involvement, October/November 2009
8. Yate/Chipping Sodbury community visioning workshop/exhibition, June and November 2009
9. North Fringe of Bristol community visioning workshops (UWE), December 2009
10. Extra Care Housing event, December 2009
11. Environment Partnership Strategic Green Infrastructure (GI) event, January 2010
12. Open space, sport and recreation consultation event, February 2010

A summary of each event follows with more detailed reports of the outcomes contained in the appendices.

1) South Gloucestershire Youth Summits, November 2008 and November 2009 (see Appendix 1)

November 2008
Details of this event are recorded in the Issues & Options Engagement Statement available separately.

November 2009
The theme of the 2009 Youth Summit was to educate young people about how local authorities work and how the community is able to become involved with the Local Authority and its partner organisations. Each School sent up to eight delegates from Year 8/9 (ages 12-14). The Core Strategy workshop covered the way places are shaped over time, and looked ahead to the kind of places, facilities and services these young people would need in adult life through an examination of their aspirations for the future. A summary of the feedback received at the workshop is available at Appendix 1.

2) South Gloucestershire Partnership Conference, February 2009
Details of this event are recorded in the Issues & Options engagement statement available separately.

3) Bitton Residents Association meeting, April 2009
Details of this event are recorded in the Issues & Options engagement statement available separately.
4) Town and Parish Council briefing event, Greenfield Centre, 9th February 2009 (see also Appendix 2 for attendance list)

This event was attended by Town and Parish councillors and clerks, Safer and Stronger community groups and community plan groups. Approximately half of South Gloucestershire’s Town and Parish Councils were represented at the event. Many of the participants also represented Safer & Stronger community groups and/or community plan groups. The purpose of the event was to share good practice and for participants to learn how South Gloucestershire Council departments and other local agencies work.

Officers from the Spatial Planning Team were present to promote and answer questions on the Core Strategy, Statement of Community Involvement and the Local Development Framework. The aim of this was to raise awareness of the Local Development Framework and to encourage attendees to take an active involvement in its production from the earliest possible stages.

5) Local Strategic Partnership meeting (see Appendix 3)

As part of a commitment to keep the Local Strategic Partnership updated and involved in the preparation of the Core Strategy, officers from the Spatial Planning team attended the LSP meeting on 29th September 2009 which included representatives from a wide range of local organisations. They gave a presentation providing 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. This was followed by questions and a discussion with the Strategic Partners. The minutes of this meeting are available at Appendix 3.

6) Children and Young People – Use Your Voice Event, 28th October 2009 (see Appendix 4)

The event took place at the Old School Youth Centre, Kingswood. Use Your Voice events have been developed as a means of effectively engaging young people across South Gloucestershire in a range of consultations. They are facilitated by the Council’s Youth Service Participation Team and held bi-annually.

The event was used to consult young people on the Safer Stronger Communities Strategy and the Core Strategy. Workshops were devised by Youth Participation workers in partnership with representatives from the Planning and Community Services departments from the Council. A report detailing the activities undertaken at the event is available at Appendix 4.

7) Thornbury workshop, exhibition and informal web involvement, October/November 2009 (see Appendices 5 and 6)

A local stakeholder workshop was held on October 20th 2009 at the Armstrong Hall, Thornbury, at which a draft vision and possible options for residential development were discussed. The options were based on comments and suggestions submitted to the Council during the Issues and Options consultation and were presented to seek further understanding and awareness of the issues and choices that could be
available. A summary report on the outcomes of the stakeholder workshop is available at Appendix 5. A public exhibition followed in the evening of the same day where all the information available at the earlier workshop was displayed for members of the public to discuss and comment. The workshop and public exhibition was well publicised and received considerable local media interest.

The material was then placed on the Council’s consultation website for informal comment for one month. Details are contained at Appendix 6. A summary of the comments received by the Council as part of this informal engagement is available at Appendix 6.

The organisation of the event and production of the consultation material was undertaken by the Thornbury Steering Group. This group consisted of district and town council members and community representatives who had been involved in preparing the Thornbury Town Centre Strategy, supported by officers of the Council. As a result this process has informed the preparation of the Core Strategy and proposals for Thornbury.

8) Yate/Chipping Sodbury workshop/exhibitions (June and November 2009) (see also Appendices 7 and 8)

A Steering Group for Yate/Chipping Sodbury, made up of district, town and parish representatives, South Gloucestershire councillors and officers, was established to set the agenda for the public engagement process. The Group guided the content and format of the consultation events and oversaw all aspects of the planning of the events. The group met frequently prior to the event to discuss the draft vision, objectives and draft options for Yate/Chipping Sodbury. The group reviewed the successes and lessons learnt from the consultation events and considered the main points arising from the event to be taken forward by officers. As a result this process has informed the preparation of the Core Strategy and proposals for Yate and Chipping Sodbury.

The purpose of the two community visioning workshops was to ask the local community how they would like to see Yate and Chipping Sodbury develop over the next 15 to 20 years. This was undertaken on the basis that although many people were concerned about the impact of future development, it was important to explore the issues and challenges in order to be clear about what it expected to achieve and that this could be reflected in the Core Strategy.

The first workshop held in June 2009 asked participants to review the results of the Issues and Options consultation. The workshop then considered the needs of the existing community and how the community needed to change and improve. The attendees considered and worked up a draft vision and strategic objectives (see Appendix 7). The second workshop held in November 2009 asked participants to consider which of the spatial areas around the settlements performed best in achieving the stated vision and strategic objectives for the towns (see Appendix 8).

9) North Fringe of Bristol workshops, 2nd December 2009 (see also Appendix 9)

The workshops were held at the University of the West of England Exhibition and Conference Centre over two sessions (morning and evening) and were attended by
key stakeholder organisations. Attendees broke into working groups to consider what a vision for the communities of the North Fringe of Bristol should look like and how the vision for the North Fringe of Bristol can be best realised. A summary report on the outcomes of the stakeholder workshop is available at Appendix 9.

10) Extra Care event, December 2009 (see also Appendix 10)

Extra care housing allows people to live as independently as possible, in an affordable home of their own, while knowing support is available if they need it.

The event was held at Emersons Green Village Hall. Participants were a mixture of senior Council managers, private sector older people’s housing providers and developers and Registered Social Landlords. The purpose of the seminar was to determine the views of a range of private sector providers looking at:

1. What inhibited organisations from developing extra care in South Gloucestershire.
2. What sort of additional information, if any, would organisations need regarding the market.
3. What sort of models of extra care housing would organisations consider.

11) Environment Partnership GI event 18th January 2010 (see also Appendix 11)

The event was held at Turnberrie’s Community Centre, Thornbury, to consider Green Infrastructure in South Gloucestershire. The aim of the event was to provide information on the emerging policy position on strategic green infrastructure in the Core Strategy and to provide the opportunity for discussing and commenting on the policy proposals relating to GI Objectives. Attendees were also invited to submit comments on the draft Open Space Standards Policy.

The event also provided information on existing strategic green infrastructure assets and projects and gave the opportunity to start to identify green infrastructure opportunities, why they are important and how they can be delivered. A report of the event is available at Appendix 11.

12) Open Space, Sport and Recreation Consultation Event, February 2010 (see also Appendix 12)

The workshop event was held at Thornbury Leisure Centre to consider open spaces, sport and recreation facilities. The event was an evening workshop, with invitations sent to South Gloucestershire Councillors, all town and parish councils, secondary school head teachers, local friends groups, environmental, local safer stronger groups, hub clubs, leisure providers and sports associations.

The evening provided people with an opportunity to express their views on the quantity, quality and accessibility of open space, sport and recreation facilities in their area. The district was split into five areas, with a table focusing on the north fringe of the Bristol urban area, the east fringe of the Bristol urban area, Yate/Chipping Sodbury, Thornbury and rural areas, participants were grouped to focus on their area. The aim of the workshop was to provide an understanding as to why the
Council has been undertaking consultation on open space, sport and recreation, what the current provision is like, what are the issues, what are the priorities for the future and how can joint working create better outcomes. A report on the event is available at Appendix 12.

3.0 South Gloucestershire Council Member involvement

3.1 As stated in Planning Policy Statement 12 (Local Spatial Planning), Local authorities have a key role in leading their communities, creating prosperity and fostering local identity and civic pride. Communities need civic leadership to help bring together the local public, voluntary and community sectors together with private enterprise in order to create a vision of how to respond to and address a locality’s problems, needs and ambitions and build a strategy to deliver the vision in a coordinated way. South Gloucestershire Council elected members were therefore 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 in February 2010. The purpose of the briefing session was to present the initial findings of a Renewable & Low Carbon Energy Potential study for South Gloucestershire and invite discussion and views prior to finalisation of the report.

   c) The Core Strategy Rural Areas Members Steering Group is composed of Councillors who represent the rural areas of South Gloucestershire. The Steering Group met on four occasions in October, November and December 2009. The purpose of the meetings was to informally seek members’ views on the following:

   - The current approach to housing distribution implemented through village settlement boundaries and other possible approaches.
   - Affordable housing and rural exception sites.
   - The rural economy including home working, employment land safeguarding, diversification and local food production.
   - Rural transport issues and accessibility.
   - Renewable energy and climate change.
   - Green belt and AONB policy.
Appendix 1 - November 2009 Youth Summit Report

Delegates were drawn from the following schools:

Bradley Stoke Community
Culverhill
Downend Secondary
Filton High
Kingsfield Secondary
Mangotsfield Secondary
Marlwood Secondary
Patchway Community College
Warmley Park

The theme of this year’s Youth Summit was ‘Movers and Shakers’ and the purpose was to educate young people about how local authority’s work, the range of issues we cover and how the community can get involved with the Local Authority and our partner organisations (e.g. parishes, health service, police, etc). Each School sent up to eight delegates from Year 8/9 (ages 12-14). The workshop was wide ranging in the topics covered (see below for list of workshops).

The Core Strategy workshop covered the way places are shaped over time, and looked ahead to the kind of places, facilities and services these young people would need in adult life through an examination of their aspirations for the future.

Exercise One

The purpose of exercise one was to get the students thinking about the nature of change in our societies and the impact that change has on our lives. Students were given dates ranging from the 1850’s to the present day. They were then asked to place images of objects into the correct decade. The images were of schools, shopping, houses, childrens’ play, transport, communications, energy and dress. Not all images ended in the correct decade, which prompted discussion about the level and rate of change that took place for some types of places and for technologies.

Exercise One - Outcomes from the discussion

Communications technology was a particularly interesting area of discussion, with comments about future developments having the potential to have an even greater impact on our lives e.g. home working, easier communication across the world, access to information and training potential. Also use of ‘smart’ technology in managing the home/workplace (e.g. being able to manage heating, lighting, music, cooking, etc remotely. The discussion also considered the potential hazards of change (e.g. future energy security, the impact of the internal combustion engine and car use on climate change, the future of electric cars and their power demands, congestion may not lessen, etc). Technology allows things like computers to get smaller – how small can we go with these things and how quick will they work?

Shape and quality of housing pretty similar today as it was 100 years ago (more space and more comfort, more outdoor space), the physical dimensions of houses probably won’t change but things like energy use, freer open plan design, access to more shared outdoor areas etc will.

People love their cars. If personal transport continues, then so will congestion. Electric cars, possibly solar powered cars will develop quickly.

Children’s play has changed. More creative but also more formal stuff happens. Need places where children can hang out safely.
Shopping has changed with a less personal service. This will probably continue – we still need food. What about where we grow our food and how it is delivered? Much more local, possibly hard to get what we need from the UK. More transport from overseas?

**Exercise Two**

Students were asked to identify the activities they undertook now, in three locations – the place where they lived, the place where they relaxed and the place where they went to school (worked). They were then asked to consider how they expected to live/relax/learn or work in ten and twenty years time, and to consider what type, quality and character of places they might need or want for the activities they identified.

**Exercise Two outcomes**

**What we do now (age 13)**

1. **Where we live**
   Sleeping in, tv, hot tub in garden, iPod, texting, computer games, musical instruments, play with pets, help dad with car, games consoles, gas heating, play footie or basket ball in the garden, mobile hairdresser cuts hair at home, walk to the local shop for sweets, help in the garden, friendly neighbours, caravan, social networking, terraced 2 bed. Tread mill, grow own veg, DIY, babysit brother, expensive bus to town, go to park near home, walk to friend’s house.

   Range of living accommodation from inner city, suburban and rural locations, flats and houses, scale of housing and gardens very wide, ‘posh’ housing seen as detached residence in grounds, preferably rural or semi rural location. Majority live in private suburban housing.

   Car use significant, with most taken to school by car

   Activities undertaken in the home and immediate residential environs

   Travel to activities by car, rather than walk or cycle (not many had bikes)

2. **Where we relax**
   drama, cinema, facebook, Wii, texting, play in the garden, basketball on the drive, go to the sports centre, gym, dance class, xbox, watch tv & dvds, rugby club, drumkit and keyboard, meet friends to chat, shopping (Cabots), swimming, play footie with friends in the park, windsurfing, e-mail, listen to music, play hockey at club, horse riding, walk the dog, go to the park, play games on the computer, youth club, park and leisure centre nearby,

   Lots of electronic activities, fewer outdoor pursuits, and mostly organised clubs and societies, little ‘free time’. Few with bikes. Lots of time being taken to activities by parents, not a lot of activities with parents.

3. **Where we go to school (work)**
   Drive to school, car share to school, walk to school, newspaper round, catch bus to school, 40 mins walk to work, cycle to school, open aspect, plenty of space, cramped bus, no inside play space in winter, 15 min drive to school, weekend job helping in salon, need space to hang out, interactive white boards, talk to friends, lost space because of building, use computers, sports hall, after school clubs, lunch clubs, books, library, need to move play equipment – too cramped,

   **What we will do in ten years time (age 20)**

   Everything will be more expensive

   No earth left

   Use money not cards

   Get rid of London

   More epidemics
1 Where we live
Small apartment, starting to make a family, live close to home, sharing with friends, rented house or flat, student housing, live near uni, apartment, small house, walk to shop, walk or cycle about, place for car, live near countryside, self build eco friendly with garden, move to the country, move to a different country (Canada), places to cook and entertain, energy efficient, 3d tv, use smaller smarter phones, high rise flat, city centre, solar power, garden, a really modern flat.

2 Where we relax (free time)
C-POD, rugby, writing, shopping (also on line), dance, learn to drive, clubbing, gym, chat sites, travel, holidays, facebook, home cinemas, golf, extreme sports, see parents, gardening, time with friends and family, photography, sports, music, piano, dog, swimming, football, hockey, horses, x box, going to the pub, restaurants with friends, seaside, Wii.

3 Where we go to school (work)
Apprenticeship, overtime, university, game designer, photography, sail across the atlantic, hope I’ll be famous! Working, teaching geography, stage school, learned to drive, using languages, musician, part time job supporting university, Mac books for all students, author, working abroad, living and working in a different town, sports teacher, greener work place, train to be an architect, use more robots at work.

What we will do in twenty years time (age 30)

1 Where we live
Social interaction, robots to clean and maintain, still have shops, car, not petrol powered, community, catch buses to work, stay in England, space for my family, live abroad, have kids, nice, big house to live in, shop on line and home deliveries, live in a village, more repair shops and don’t throw things away, want facilities nearby- dentist/ school/gardens/ bus route, family home, live in a flat, build my own house, space for pets, may need floating houses, treat others with respect, grass roofs, house in suburbs, married, bigger house than now, health care, strong community, links, low crime, good neighbourhood, play space for kids, eco technologies, smarter technology, flying cars, car hire rather than car ownership, family car, solar panels on roofs, all the ice caps melt and the temperature gets hotter, married with kids and have a good life, life is more expensive.

2 Where we relax
Sports, home exercise like Wii, shop on line, play the piano as well as Mozart, cpod show kids how to use computer, afford skiing holidays, sailing visit parents, facebook or new thing, gym, more holidays, umpiring hockey matches, hand held tvs, family computer games, walk the dog, clubbing, visiting different countries to experience new things, learn to shoot, team games, more free time.

3 Where we go to work
Be a famous musician, architect, look after kids and husband, professional rugby, work smart for extra weekend day, hologram teachers at home, work to find cures for illnesses, become a virtual teacher, work from home in charge of a business, get a good job with lots of money, nanny, looking after kids, work with children with autism, police force, touch screen computers in desk tops, work for charity – make a change, more computer based work, journalism, more teaching outside, more eco friendly work places, kids in a good school, looking after parents, head teacher.

Exercise Three
The students were asked to consider what elements they felt would make a good city from their point of view now. Things that were important were:

- Green space at the heart and running through the city. Use of water as a feature. Parks.
• Having a proper centre, with shops, restaurants and bars for people to meet. Also local areas near home.
• Make more use of bikes. Covered cycleways.
• Good houses (spacious, with outdoor space) and allotments to grow food. Variety for everyone
• Make use of roofs as gardens/solar energy
• Mixed uses in blocks with shops, offices and flats
• Trading and bartering systems not money
• Grow your own - allotments
• Outdoor noisy places for teenagers to hang out, activities like graffiti walls, put images on the web as part of continual arts project.
• Walkable city
• Healthy, not smelly
• Car parks on city edge/edge of centre – use moving walking platforms to move people around quickly. Use electric buggies. Community bus
• Better rail and bus links
• Leisure/gym/sports/pool/pitches near houses
• church
• Zoo/ice rink/ theme parks/Laser/paintballing – lots of activities around edge of centre
• Hospital/health centre/local cottage hospitals
• Community farm
• Theatre/music venue/cinemas
• Schools and colleges
• Places to work near centre and shops/bars etc. Banks
• Charity – shops and places for homeless/orphanages etc but also adopt a citywide charity like a ‘make a change’ day or a lobbying day that everyone does.
• Airport – need to get to other places quickly (impact on environment – use train!)
• Water supplies
Appendix 2 - Town and Parish Council briefing event, Greenfield Centre, February 2009

Town & Parish Councils represented:
1. Alveston
2. Bitton
3. Charfield
4. Dodington
5. Downend & Bromley Heath
6. Frampton Cotterell
7. Hawkesbury
8. Iron Acton
9. Mangotsfield Rural
10. Oldbury on Severn
11. Oldland
12. Sodbury
13. Patchway
14. Pucklechurch
15. Rockhampton
16. Stoke Gifford
17. Winterbourne
18. Yate
19. Wickwar

Community Plan Groups represented:
1. Alveston
2. Bitton
3. Hawkesbury
4. Oldland
5. Pucklechurch
6. Wickwar
7. Winterbourne
8. Yate

Safer & Stronger Community Groups represented:
1. Bitton SSCG
2. Chipping Sodbury & Cotswold Edge
3. Downend & Bromley Heath SSCG
4. Frampton Cotterell, Westerleigh & Coalpit Health SSCG
5. Laddenbrook SSCG
6. Severnside SSCG
7. Stoke Gifford SSCG
8. Winterbourne
9. Yate SSCG
Appendix 3 - Children and Young People – Use Your Voice event, October 2009

The 4th Use Your Voice event took place on 28th October 2009 at The Old School Youth Centre, Kingswood. Use Your Voice events have been developed as a means of effectively engaging young people across South Gloucestershire in a range of consultations. They are facilitated by the Youth Service Participation Team and held bi-annually.

**Purpose**

The event was used to consult young people around two linking strategies *The Safer Stronger Communities Strategy* and *The Core Strategy*. Workshops were devised by Youth Participation workers in partnership with representatives from Planning and Community Services.

**Participants**

Participants were drawn from a database of young people who have been involved in participation projects and events. Invites were also distributed to Youth Service Projects, Children’s Fund Projects, Connexions, CAHMS, Children’s Social Services, Disabled Young People and Schools through The South Gloucestershire Participation Workers Network.

39 young people from across South Gloucestershire attended the day, a breakdown is detailed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Format of the Day**

**Introduction** The day began with 2 whole group warm up activities, clumps and Agree/Disagree. These introduced young people to the themes of the day and served as a means of collecting data around views of areas and aspirations.

**Workshops** Young people were split into 3 groups dependant on a coloured sticker they were given when registering and participated in the following workshops, on a rota basis, each lasting 50mins:

- **People Power (Safer Stronger Communities Strategy)**
- **Back to The Future (The Core Strategy)**
- **Archery or Music Making**
**Consultation & Workshop Outcomes**

**Clumps** – young people were asked a series of options and then asked to clump in a certain space to indicate their response.

This activity showed most of the young people who attended lived in rural or semi-rural areas, which could explain a high number of young people getting to school via bus or car. It also showed young people were engaged in a range of social activities but a significant number spent their free time at their or their friend’s homes.

**Agree/Disagree** – a series of statements were read out and young people had to show whether they agreed, disagreed or were unsure by placing themselves at either end or in the middle of a hall.

This exercise showed an overwhelming number of young people wanted to get a house and a good job when they were older. The majority also wanted to move away from the area they currently lived in and learn to drive. A high proportion felt that they did not have a good transport system.

It also showed more people felt safe in their areas than not, more than not also felt their local parks were full of rubbish. The majority of young people felt that they could have a say in things that went on in their life’s, this high response could reflect the participants experience of being involved in Use Your Voice and similar events. Around half felt there was lots to do in their area and that they were respected in the community.

**People Power (Safer Stronger Communities Strategy)**

**Aim:**
For young people to identify issues in their community and present ideas and solutions to improve them.

**Method:**
- Ideas Tree with the 6 Safer Stronger key themes listed on different branches
- Piles of 2 different coloured paper leaves
- Brief introduction by Head of Safer South Gloucestershire.

**Implementation:**
In 3 small groups each supported by either a Participation worker or Safer Stronger Communities representative young people discussed the different themes and wrote on the leaves, one colour identifying issues the other solutions.

**Outcomes:**
Young people’s input is being collated by the Community Consultation Officer, feedback will be given to young people following the consultation period which will be complete in December 2009. The consultation report will clearly show young peoples input and impact.

**Back to The Future (The Core Strategy)**

**Aims:**
For young people to identify their needs now and in the future in relation to different areas of their life.
Method:
Time Quiz – to introduce the idea of how life has changed over the last century e.g. developments in technology, social policy

Time Targets - split into 3 different areas Home/School & Work/Free Time and ages, Now/20’s/30’s.

Implementation:
Young people matched a series of pictures to dates.

In small groups young people supported by a Participation worker and experts from the Planning team used giant targets to identify their real and perceived needs at different ages in relation to Home (including the area where they lived) Work/Education and Free Time. Following discussion, post-it notes were used for young people to record their thoughts and then stuck on the relevant section of the target.

Free time
Now – mainly focused around meeting their friends or boyfriend/girlfriend at youth/activity groups or in parks or shops. Young people had a range of interests and hobbies, however, a significant proportion (18) listed Internet or Gaming as how they spent their free time, a large number (17) participated in sports & physical activities such as Dance and Biking with arts and creative activities being less popular. 11 spent time engaging in nuisance/anti-social behaviour such setting fire to bins and getting onto roof tops, a further 9 listed consuming Drugs and Alcohol during their free time.

20’s Equal amounts of young people (5) thought that they would be able to drive a car, spend their free time in the pub and be involved in some type of volunteering activity in their twenties. Following on from that, some young people (3) saw themselves as travelling, shopping or spending time with a girlfriend/boyfriend or significant others. Fewer (2) thought they would be going clubbing at that age, meeting friends or sleeping. Only one thought they would start a family or get married by this age.

Most (3) thought they would be spending time with boy or girlfriend or significant others, while 2 imagined they would spend time with friends. There were low indicators (1) of starting a family or getting married by this age. Socially, the majority (5) thought they would be going to the pub in their free time, while 3 felt that they would be shopping and 2 responded that they would be clubbing, with only one respondent seeing themselves as part of a social club.

Hobbies varied (lego, music, art/graphics, writing a book, internet and gaming) but had low responses (1 for each response). On the other hand, a wide range of sports was noted by the young people, with 15 relying that they would be involved in some activity.

Aspirations; Most respondents (5) saw themselves as driving a car, or volunteering in some way, which was followed by 3 young people who wanted to travel. One wanted to go to University, along with moving to Wales, moving out of home, getting arrested. Two thought they would spend more time sleeping.
30's – People: 5 young people imagined they would have children by this age, along with 3 who would be married and an equal amount would still be with their families. Only one replied that they would still be spending time with friends.

Social: An equal number of young people (3) thought they would be partying/clubbing or going to the pub.

Hobbies: 3 young people will have a pet, 2 will be relaxing by this age and, conversely the same amount would be active. Other replies with low responses of one young person were; to keep learning, music, shopping, being creative, betting, cooking and sleeping.

Sports: the highest response was 4 young people who would be going to the gym still, with one young person doing either judo, football, yoga.

Aspirations: One young person thought they would be teaching karate, a chocolate tester, belong to St. John's Ambulance, a dog walker, a qualified mental health nurse, an accountant or a babysitter. Other responses were noted such as owning property abroad, getting arrested twice, own a car, own a house and 2 young people really had no idea what they would be doing at this age.

Home
Now: There was a wide ranging set of results for this area of life, although not a lot of variation and there was no one answer in particular which scored significantly higher than the others. Many young people (3) spend their home time at the shops or on their computers. Followed by equal numbers of respondents (2) who stayed in the house, visit family, live with their parents, live in the city, socialise with their parents, do homework or coursework, go to parks, or go to a youth club or bus. The remainder of young people (1 for each answer) spend time with the parents, hanging around Downend or Downend school, lives in the countryside, works at home, babysitting, looking after a younger sister, going to skate parks, sleeping, relaxing, talking to people, watching TV, walks a lot, has access to cars, has a pet, singing and using the bus.

20s: 5 young people said they see them selves living in the same area as they live now, whereas 2 said they would be living in a different area, and one said they would like a part rural, part city environment. 3 would live alone, 3 would live in their own house and five would be in a flat. Only one would live in a council house. An additional 2 would live away from their parents. Three would be at University and the same number would be travelling and one would have a camper van to explore with. Three would also like to be living abroad. Interestingly, four would remain in England but move to a different city or county. Four would own a car and one thought they would be homeless. Only 2 thought they would have lots of money or a well paid job. Three would be married and two would have children.

30s: the majority of respondents (8) said they would have a family or kids by now. Another seven said they would be living abroad. Fewer (4) said they would be married. Equal numbers (3) would move to the countryside or own a large mansion, with another three aspiring to own a house or a flat. Only one would be living in the same house as when they were younger or renting a house. Less young people would be travelling in their thirties (1).
Two would foster children and the same amount would move away from where they are living now. Conversely, two would stay in the same area and two would have moved out of the parental home by now.

Again one thought they would be homeless. Four thought they would be dead by then with a further one thinking they would have a drug problem. An additional one thought they would be in rehab or have mental health issues.

**Work/School**

**Now:** 11 are doing their GCSE’s and 2 are studying for their A Levels, and 2 in college, with one admitting to non attendance at school. Also 2 are excluded from school and one is on a tag or has been arrested. Nine walk to school, 2 go by car, 2 by bus. Four spend their school time doing coursework. Two have a part time job and the same number spend time with friends. Other activities were; Sound engineering, singing/music making, street dancing, gymnastics, paintballing and one was bored.

**20s:** 25 see themselves as being in University or College, 26 would have a full time job. Two would be on a gap year or be working with helicopters with three being professional sportspeople.

**30s:** 20 knew the type of job which they would have by now, including; Astronomer, Hospital specialist, Aeronautical engineer, Care worker, Rugby coach, Midwife, Policeman, Artist, Accountant, Volcanologist, Theatre work, Translator, Chef, Karate Instructor, Naturalist, Takeaway shop employee, Physicist. 5 would have changed jobs from their twenties or taken a promotion. 4 would be married or engaged. Equal numbers of young people (2) would either be; having children or adopting them. One would be travelling the world and one would be a multi-millionaire. Two wanted to be clever by this age and a further two would be able to speak Greek.

**Analysis**

**Free Time**
Most young people seem to see themselves as moving on from playing video games or surfing the internet towards socialising or going to pubs or clubs by the time they are in their twenties. Significantly only a very few were able to see themselves being married or having a family by this time. However, this changes by the time they are in their thirties, where a higher number of respondents said they would have a family by that time. A lot of enthusiasm for sporting activities was shown throughout the different age brackets, although this was still high on the young people’s agendas for to continue this into adulthood. Maybe surprisingly, a small number of respondents said they would own a car by the time they are in their thirties.

**Home**
During their twenties, moving out of the family home was popular, thought the results ranged from staying close to their parental home to living alone or in a different area. Equally as important was living abroad. However, the hope that they would have a well-paid job by this time was low. Getting married or having a family increased during the thirties, as did the wish to travel, in addition to more young people who would like to live abroad.

**Work/School**
Most young people are studying for exams, with a very small number who are excluded. Aspirations for future careers seemed to be more definite by the time
young people reach their twenties and particularly during their thirties, with solid ideas about the types of jobs they would like to be doing. Encouragingly, almost as many young people have aspirations to go onto University or College as knew which type of job they wanted. Some young people saw promotion or a change of jobs by the time they are in their thirties.

Overall, the activity went well, most young people were fully engaged in all aspects. However, some did have difficulties imagining themselves in twenty years time and this may have contributed to some responses like, “I have no idea what I will be doing then”.

Activity Based
Young people were given a choice to participate in either Archery or Music-Making. Both proved to be popular activities were young people could develop or build upon their skills. It was also felt to be important to provide a fun activity based workshop to balance out the consultation workshops and as a means of rewarding their participation.

Evaluation
The event was evaluated using a Whooh rating. Young people made a Quiet, Medium or Loud Whooh noise to feedback on different aspects of the day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whooh</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Workshops</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Food</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Music made during the activity workshop was also played.

Recognition All young people received an accredited outcome and certificate.
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Agenda Item 6

South Gloucestershire Local Strategic Partnership

Tuesday, 29th September, 2009

Present

Fergus Allan (ALCA)
Alistair Beattie on behalf of Jon Doble (Faith Groups)
Emma Collier (CVS South Gloucestershire)
Councillor John Godwin, South Gloucestershire Council (in the Chair)
Nigel Eagers on behalf of Kevin Hamblin (Filton College)
Roger Pedley on behalf of Dr Chris Payne (NHS - South Gloucestershire)
Rachel Robinson (The Care Forum)
David Salmon (Avon Fire & Rescue)

Opposition Party Representative: Ruth Davis

Advisors:

Heritage Forum: Stan Sims
Police Authority: Dr Peter Heffer
GOSW: Stella Milsom

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from:

Councillor John Calway, Sir Chris Clarke, Mike Collins, Councillor Sheila Cook, Jon Edwards, Chris Foley, Andy Francis, Steve Grainger, Penny Harris, Nigel Hutchings, Councillor Roger Hutchinson, David Primrose, Councillor Matthew Riddle and John Rusforth.

80 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS (Agenda Item 1)

The Chair welcomed everyone to meeting. He thanked Chris Clarke for Chairing the previous meeting in his absence.

81 EVACUATION PROCEDURE (Agenda Item 2)

The Chair brought the evacuation procedures to the attention of the meeting.

82 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 (Agenda Item 3)

There were no declarations of interest.
83 ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC (Agenda Item 4)

There were no items from the public.

84 ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIR DECIDES ARE URGENT (Agenda Item 5)

There were no urgent items.

85 MINUTES - 28 JULY 2009 (Agenda Item 6)

RESOLVED: That the minutes are agreed as a correct record for signing by the Chair.

86 PRIORITY NEIGHBOURHOODS (Agenda Item 7)

Robert Walsh, the Head of the Safer and Stronger Communities team, gave a presentation regarding the draft policy towards Priority Neighbourhoods.

Issues discussed included:

- That 5 priority neighbourhoods had been originally identified with West Yate and Dodington being recently added;
- That the new area had a different profile than other priority areas but results against some indices had given rise to concern;
- Targeting efforts towards key individuals and key families can make a real difference to a whole neighbourhoods quality of life;
- How do priorities identified by officers and agencies marry up with what the community has identified;
- Raising aspiration was important but so was being clear about what can and cannot be done;
- Sharing information and resources across partners was important;
- That some officers, e.g. Fire Officers, are more welcome in neighbourhoods and homes then others and may therefore be better links to people;
- Where start-up funding is identified for a project, those involved need to be supported in applying for funding to help that project continue;
- On going communication was vital for maintaining public confidence;
- Need to show how information from priority neighbourhoods influences delivery, and
- That demonstrating improved outcomes could take some time.
RESOLVED: That the presentation be noted.

87 BUDGET CONSULTATION PROPOSALS (Agenda Item 9)

Ian Webster, Chief Financial Officer for South Gloucestershire Council, attended the meeting to discuss the budget proposals for consultation.

Issues discussed included:

- The impact of the economic down turn on the public sector generally;
- That there is unlikely to be an increase in funding from central government over the next 10 years;
- Taking inflationary pressures into account this could result in a cut in real terms of 2-3% annually;
- That Service Reviews had been undertaken to identify savings in back office functions to enable front line delivery to be protected;
- That future Capital funding for projects such as Building Schools for the Future was likely to decrease;
- Formal consultation would run from November 2009 – January 2010; and
- That delivery of services through voluntary partners can improve efficacy and efficiency.

RESOLVED: That the information be noted.

88 PLACE SURVEY/VIEWPOINT (Agenda Item 10)

Caroline Matcham, Customer Relations Manager for South Gloucestershire Council, gave a presentation regarding the results of the Place and Viewpoint surveys and the multi-organisational approach to raising awareness.

Issues discussed included:

- That the results present a mixed picture with some responses improving and some responses worsening;
- Whether the economic downturn and subsequent budgetary restraints would have an impact on public perceptions; and
- Communications need to be co-ordinated with partners to improve the impact of messages.
89 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK UPDATE (Agenda Item 8)

Patrick Conroy the Spatial Planning Team Manager and Dan Jones Principal Planning Officer gave presentations providing an update on the Core Strategy, Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Issues discussed included:

- That Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) is now subject to further delay due to national issues and may not be published until the new year;
- That there is a risk that the RSS would not be approved by the Secretary of State before the election;
- That work on the Core Strategy would continue despite of the ongoing uncertainty and that it was still important for the Council and Partners to continue working on it's policy framework to support sustainable communities;
- Partners support for the Gypsy DPD was vital;
- That many lessons have been learnt from previous large scale developments such as Bradley Stoke and Emersons Green would be considered;
- That infrastructure would be needed to support growth; and
- Community representatives, partners and politicians need to engage in debate about sustainable growth of communities.

RESOLVED: That the presentations be noted.

90 COMPREHENSIVE AREA ASSESSMENT (CAA) (Agenda Item 11)

Andy Davies Head of HR & Organisational Development gave an update regarding the initial feedback arising from the Audit Commission’s recent inspection.

Issues discussed included:

- That initial feedback had been positive;
- That further information had been provided to answer matters arising;
- That a draft Assessment would be provided soon; and
- That officers were not expecting any 'red flags' given for areas of concern and hoping for one 'green flag' for innovation.
RESOLVED:

1. That officers circulate the draft CAA to appropriate partners; and

2. Bring a further report on the CAA to the January meeting of the South Gloucestershire Council LSP.

91 INDUCTION SESSION – COMPACT CONSULTATION (Agenda Item 12)

Emma Collier from the South Gloucestershire Council for Voluntary Services gave a verbal update regarding the review of South Gloucestershire Voluntary Sector Compact.

Issues discussed included:

- That the work, funded by the South Gloucestershire Local Strategic Partnership, was linked to National Indicator 7 which aimed for a thriving local voluntary sector;
- That review was interested in seeing how embedded and effective the compact was;
- That increased involvement in policy development was developing as an issue;
- That sometimes consultation periods imposed from central government are not compliant with the Compact; and
- That the public sector are not always flexible in their relationships with the voluntary sector.

RESOLVED: That a further report on the Compact be brought to a future meeting of the South Gloucestershire Local Strategic Partnership.

92 FEEDBACK FROM STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS (Agenda Item 13)

The Chair presented the feedback from Strategic Partners.

(A) Children and Young People – No questions or comments.

(B) Environment – No questions or comments.

(C) Economy and Skills

Issues discussed included:

- The importance of skills and retraining;
- The potential growth in environmental technology sectors;
- Whether promotional leaflets on cycling, countryside access and heritage could be combined to improve efficacy and reduce cost; and
• The impact of tourism in the area.

(D) Safer and Stronger Communities

Issues discussed included:
• The impact of the recession on crime and disorder;
• The recent Select Committee report into Anti-Social Behaviour; and
• Impact of the new Flytipping Strategy.

(E) Health and Well-Being

Issues discussed included:
• Update date on the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment;
• The personalisation of care agenda;
• Should the Police and/or the Fire and Rescue Services be represented in the Health and Well Being Partnership.

RESOLVED: That the updates be noted.

93 SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE PARTNERSHIP REVIEW (Agenda Item 14)

Stephanie Kruse, Strategic Partnership Officer, presented the report which updated partners on the outcomes of the governance consultation process and invited partners to agree its governance option for implementation.

Issues discussed included:
• The consultation response given to the proposals in September;
• That the 5 Strategic Partners wish to maintain the link to the board; and
• The implications of recent legislative changes in Scrutiny.

RESOLVED:

1. That partners formally agree the new governance arrangements as outlined in the report

2. That partners agree to receive implementation proposals and an action plan for taking recommendations forward to improve process and practice.
94 PARTNERS CONFERENCE (Agenda Item 15)

The Chairman led a discussion on the progress in the arrangements for the Partners Conference.

Issues discussed included:

- That a date in February would be arranged;
- That a possible subject would be planning for the economic recovery, the skills agenda and delivering more for less;
- How the Comprehensive Area Assessment could be used in the discussions; and
- That inspirational people would be needed to lead the discussions;

RESOLVED: That the information be noted.

95 PROVISIONAL WORK PROGRAMME (Agenda Item 16)

Partners were asked to forward any ideas for future meetings as the partnership encouraged the participation of all rather than simply Council driven issues.

RESOLVED: That the programme be endorsed.

Meeting closed 13:15

Chair
Appendix 5 – October 2009 Thornbury Workshop Report

Report of the Stakeholder Workshop held on 20th October 2009 at the Armstrong Hall, Thornbury, to launch the Thornbury Town Centre Strategy and investigate possible future development options

Introduction

The Thornbury Town Centre Strategy contains a number of aims and objectives to help increase the vibrancy of Thornbury town centre. A launch event workshop for the strategy was held on 20th October 2009 at the Armstrong Hall in Thornbury to which a number of local community representatives attended. There was also an evening exhibition.

South Gloucestershire Council is preparing a planning document called the Core Strategy. This will set out how the Council can meet the need for new houses and jobs whilst protecting our countryside, heritage and environment. The Core Strategy can help to deliver some of the aims and objectives of the Town Centre Strategy.

The events on 20th October were used as an opportunity to ensure the results from the Thornbury Town Centre Strategy are fed into and help to inform the council’s emerging Core Strategy. As part of the event the local community were also asked how they would like to see Thornbury develop over the next 15-20 years. Several possible options for limited housing/employment development were shown that attendees to the events gave their opinions on.

This factual report summarises the exercise results and opinions expressed by the participants that occurred at the stakeholder workshop. These results will be used to inform the drafting of the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy.

Workshop Attendee list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headteacher, Gillingstool Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Melrose Pubcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman, Thornbury and District Heritage Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLP Planning Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornbury Musical Theatre Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman, Concern for Thornbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher, Oldbury-on-Severn Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Manager, Fearson Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner, Barton Willmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton Willmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Planning Team Manager, SGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chartered Surveyor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornbury Town Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of Governors, St Mary’s CE VA Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitor, Kirby Simcox, Thornbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds of Thornbury estate agents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chair, Thornbury Churches Together
Member of Castle School Student Council
Member of Castle School Student Council
Thornbury FM
Persimmon Homes
South Gloucestershire and Thornbury Town Councillor
Assistant Head Teacher, Castle School
Chairman, Thornbury Art Club
Department for Children and Young People, SGC
McLoughlin Planning
Thornbury Chamber of Commerce
South Gloucestershire and Thornbury Town Councillor
School & Early Years Organisation Officer, SGC
Castle School Chair of Governors

Facilitators/scribes
Community Projects Manager, SGC
Spatial Planning Team
Principal Planning Officer, SGC
Principal Planning Officer, SGC
Community Projects Officer, SGC
Principal Planning Officer, SGC
Urban Designer, SGC
Strategic Partnership Officer, SGC
Planning Officer, SGC
Principal Planning Officer, SGC

Introduction – Thornbury Town Centre Strategy

Cllr Shirley Holloway introduced the afternoon and formerly launched the Thornbury Town Centre Strategy. The ten year Strategy is a visionary document reflecting the aspirations of local residents and businesses. It aims to address the issues of priority to the town centre of Thornbury on an economic, social and environmental level over the next ten years.

Cllr Holloway outlined how the Strategy had been prepared and described the commitment the community had devoted to its preparation.

The strategy’s strategic vision is:

To build upon the natural, historic and cultural assets of the centre of Thornbury in order to maintain and further develop social, economic and environmental prosperity

This vision will be realised through three main aims:

- To ensure the centre of Thornbury thrives by attracting quality and specialist retailers in order to encourage more customers.
- To ensure the centre of Thornbury continues to be a safe, inclusive and accessible place for people to live, work, shop and visit.
• To ensure the centre of Thornbury becomes widely known as a well maintained and eco-friendly market town.

The Town Centre Strategy is available at [www.southglos.gov.uk](http://www.southglos.gov.uk)

**South Gloucestershire Core Strategy**

A presentation was then given on how the Core Strategy could help to deliver some of the aims and aspirations of the Town Centre Strategy. An outline of previous consultation results was given:

2007 residents’ questionnaire & stakeholder workshops main messages:
- Residents highly value the good quality environment, access to green space & local shops
- Shortage of affordable housing and small dwellings for both the elderly & young people/families
- Car dependent town with heavy in/out commuting; very little use of public transport

2008 Core Strategy questionnaire main messages:
- Residents think that the town centre is suffering
- Local primary schools not filled
- Thornbury may benefit from some further employment
- 60% of respondents in favour of some more housing development

2008 Thornbury Town Council residents’ questionnaire main messages:
- Family and elderly housing needs need to be fulfilled
- 60% of respondents in favour of some housing development
- Concern over the preservation of the historic environment and landscape and whether further development may exacerbate traffic problems

A steering group of officers, local Councillors and community representatives which oversaw the co-ordination of these events had analysed the results of previous consultations together with the aims of the Town Centre Strategy. This work had enabled the creation a draft vision for Thornbury to be presented and discussed at the workshop. The suggested wording put forward for discussion at the workshop was:

> **Thornbury will be a thriving and socially cohesive historic market town with a diverse range of employment opportunities. The vibrant town centre will provide a range of facilities for the needs of its residents, visitors & workers, as well as its surrounding villages.**

> These aims will have been supported by an appropriate amount of housing growth which will have helped to strengthen and develop the town centre, local schools and community facilities and activities. This growth will have provided for the needs of young families and the elderly. The town centre will have built on its rich historic character and setting and will be promoting itself as an attraction, a centre for the arts and an exciting place to shop.
It was explained that the Core Strategy vision for Thornbury must be concise and deliverable and based on what Thornbury will be like in 2026. Through ongoing community engagement this draft vision will be refined and developed.

After the presentations attendees split into five working groups and began work on two exercises for the remainder of the afternoon.

### Exercise 1 – comments on the draft Core Strategy vision

**Q1) Building on consultation to date and the aims of the Town Centre Strategy, are these the right themes for a vision to be included in the Council's Core Strategy?** –

- Importance of a sustaining a continuing thriving market town.
- Vibrant town centre, building on its rich historic character and strong local ties.
- Continued high educational achievement through successful schools.
- More diverse range of jobs.
- An appropriate amount of new housing that helps to cater for the needs of young families and the elderly.

**Q2) What specific issues and objectives must the Core Strategy deal with to make sure that a Thornbury vision can be delivered? Identify the top priorities.**

**Summarised comments/discussions from participants:**

Most participants were in general agreement with the draft vision and its themes, however some participants felt that the vision should be more aspirational, especially in terms of encouraging Thornbury to be a centre for food, the arts and independent shops. Other specific comments made:

**Town Centre and facilities**

- Better quality of shops needed; more individual and specialist retailers needed.
- Make the town centre attractive to businesses not just retail.
- Important to sustain a leisure centre that meets the needs of the community and surrounding villages.
- Car parking in and around the town centre must not be allowed to become any more congested.
- Build on the success of the farmers’ market.
- Public consultation currently happening on the future of Thornbury hospital; possibly expand outpatients and community facilities.

**Education/schools**

- Thornbury is well known for its high educational achievement.
- Continued downturn in the need for primary school places; that will bring into question the future viability of schools at their current size. At present the total surplus spaces in all Thornbury primary schools equates to approximately 1.5 forms of entry or the equivalent of one primary school.
A typical development of 500-600 dwellings would yield an average of 160-190 children depending upon the size and mix of houses and flats. That number of children would fill approximately 50% of the projected surplus places in Thornbury primary schools in 2013. A development of about 1,200 homes would generate enough primary school children to fill all of the projected surplus places.

School buildings should be seen and used as a community resource and source of local employment and not allowed to close.

The Castle School (which has 1,700 pupils) requires reconstruction due to ageing buildings.

Castle School’s 6th Form unit, Gloucester Road. Ageing, small building which will soon be unfit for purpose; size limits courses, maintenance is big drain on resources; distance from main site. Aspiration for the 6th form to grow and take on board vocational as well as academic courses. Separate buildings but on same site would be preferable. Replacement would cost £22 – 30 million so would need considerable more houses to help fund.

Education for all ages should feature in the vision; not just school age, but also pre-school.

Transport
Public transport is insufficient at present to achieve significant reduction in car commuting in/out of the town. The vision should support an integrated public transport system. Many people would rather use public transport but it needs to be more attractive and the times more useful.

Any new housing should not make existing parking congestion worse. Free parking in Thornbury town centre is a business attraction

There should be improved signage showing walking/cycling routes to and from the town centre.

Environment
Strong attraction of town is proximity of green fields. You can walk into green fields from high street.

Very important to maintain the attractive historic character of the town, to ensure that it continues to be an attractive place to live and to encourage visitors to the town to support the retail centre and tourism.

The Conservation Area needs to be preserved.

Employment
Keep more people working in the town through developing small business units. There is potential to develop small scale high tech industries

There is high out-commuting of residents into Bristol for employment. There is also high in-commuting for lower-paid employment. Therefore need to re-balance employment.

Focus on modernisation and marketing of existing stock to encourage vacant existing office units to be filled. If Oldbury Power Station goes ahead then this could provide jobs for Thornbury residents in which case transport to and from there would need to be improved.

The Town Centre Strategy proposes that new high technology industries should be a feature of the economy of Thornbury. Many participants felt that if there was to be new housing that there should be new employment, but that this would not necessarily reduce that amount of commuting.

Housing
Any housing must respect the historic character and setting of Thornbury.
There should be a full range of housing. Provision needs to be made for young families and the elderly, and a range of good quality housings of all sizes, types and prices is required to allow movement in the housing market.

Need to ensure that drainage and flooding issues are addressed and that any new development does not make any existing issues worse.

New housing must contribute to the town’s social and economic balance and should not enhance the town's dormitory role.

**Exercise 2 Appraisal of possible development areas**

Each group was asked to assess each possible development option (shown on separate map) against sustainability objectives. The findings of the discussions are summarised below.

**Option 1 – Upper Morton**

**Positive:**
- Site large enough to provide range of housing, including more affordable housing (potential capacity for up to 900 dwellings).
- No impact on historic character in the west of the town.
- Good location for access to potential future Oldbury Power Station development (as housing for employees).
- Not in Green Belt.

**Negative:**
- More car usage resulting from lack of facilities within walking distance.
- People would not be encouraged to use local shops or the town centre due to how far from the town centre the site is.
- Breaching Morton Way ‘boundary’ would mean Thornbury would not be as contained as it is now.
- Views of farmland from existing dwellings would be lost.

**Option 2 – Morton Way**

**Positive:**
- No impact on historic character in the west of the town.
- Good location for access to potential future Oldbury Power Station development (as housing for employees).
- Not in Green Belt.

**Negative:**
- More car usage resulting from lack of facilities within walking distance.
- People would not be encouraged to use local shops or the town centre due to how far from the town centre the site is.
- Breaching Morton Way ‘boundary’ would mean Thornbury would not be as contained as it is now.
- Views of farmland from existing dwellings would be lost.
Option 3 – Morton Way/Grovesend Road
Positive:
- Site large enough to provide range of housing, including more affordable housing (potential capacity for up to 900 dwellings).
- No impact on historic character in the west of the town.
- Not in Green Belt.

Negative:
- Too far to walk to town centre therefore people would use their cars. This would make parking problems in the centre worse or encourage commuting to the Mall.
- Concern about the potential loss of or adverse impact on existing nature conservation areas.
- Loss of the green setting to Thornbury when viewed from Grovesend Road on entry to the town from A38.
- Breaching Morton Way ‘boundary’ would mean Thornbury would not be as contained as it is now.
- Views of farmland from existing dwellings would be lost.

Option 4 – Bristol Road
General comment - noted that this was a very small development and would the numbers be worth the disadvantages. Some participants felt that as the site is in the Green Belt (as is Option 5) it should be ruled out, however others felt that this did not matter and that the Green Belt boundary could be reviewed.

Positive:
- Could be used for older people’s accommodation due to close proximity to the town centre
- Close to the town centre - well within walking and cycling distance. This could encourage new residents to use town centre facilities.

Negative:
- Possible flooding issues in this location and the impact of excess surface water from the leisure centre.
- Loss of the attractive views. This area is part of the attractive character of Thornbury.
- Possible access problems at the junction with Bristol Road, as at peak periods there is congestion.
- As the site is small it has the disadvantage of probably not being able to provide a wide range of housing by itself.

Option 5 – West of Town Centre
General:
Some participants felt that as the site is in the Green Belt it should be ruled out. Others felt that this did not matter and that the Green Belt boundary could be reviewed.

Positive:
- Advantage of being close to the town centre.
- Close to the town centre - well within walking and cycling distance. This could encourage new residents to use town centre facilities.
Negative:
- Loss of the view of the historic Town Wall would have a large impact on the historic character of the area.
- Could be difficult to gain access to the site without extensive re-modelling of the car park area.
- As the site is small it has the disadvantage of probably not being able to provide a wide range of housing by itself.

Option 6 – Park Farm

General comments
- Access may be needed from Butt Lane – if this is provided it creates access to a large area of land.
- Some participants suggested that a lower number of dwellings would be more suitable.
- Could be suitable for community uses associated with Castle School.

Positive:
- Close to existing primary schools and Castle school.
- Closer to town centre and so greater prospect of people walking and cycling.
- Potential for development to help enable the Castle School to realise its aspirations either through developer contributions or a land swap.

Negative:
- Possible impact on the setting of Thornbury Castle, mediaeval fish ponds and Conservation Area.
- Impact of water run-off towards Oldbury would need to be overcome.
Appendix 6 – Summary of comments received as part of informal online engagement for Thornbury growth options.

Members of the public

- Flats are unsuitable for Thornbury as demand is for family housing.
- Oldbury Power Station will greatly assist in providing local employment.
- Town centre decline is due to residents shopping in supermarkets and on the internet.
- Green Belt land should not be developed, so Options 4 and 5 should not go ahead.
- People will travel out of Thornbury onto the A38 regardless of where development is located.
- Development of Option 1 has no natural boundary so development has nowhere to stop.
- Option 2 is contained by roads and would bring mains drainage to existing properties which currently lack this.
- Option 3 could bring problems of noise and air pollution to new residents due to proximity to busy Grovesend Road.
- Option 6 has flooding issues.
- Best choice for Thornbury is a combination of options 1, 2, 3 and 6. Option 2 is the best overall.
- Options 4, 5 & 6 are unacceptable due to the impact on historic character.
- Land along Midland Way and behind the trading estate should be used for housing as this would have least impact on local character.
- Locating housing further away from the town centre could encourage exercise which would reduce obesity.
- Any development must be high quality, e.g. cottages would bring back character to outlying areas.
- Option 6 is most suitable as it maintains Green Belt and is within the natural boundary of the town.
- Option 1 is second best and could include a perimeter road between Morton Way and Old Gloucester Road to contain development. Could also include shops and a school to minimise use of the car.
- Options 1 and 6 would both closest to the potential Oldbury Power Station.
- Development along Morton Way would deprive residents from easy access to the countryside in that location and would lead to an increase in traffic using rural lanes, e.g. Crossways Lane.
- Shops are too far to walk to from Morton Way.
- Development at Options 1, 2, or 3 would encourage commuting due to proximity to the A38.
- Option 6 is best due to proximity to the high street, Castle School and Oldbury power station.
- Development along Midland Way or on Alveston Hill should be further investigated due to its proximity to facilities.
- Further development cannot be justified until there is a more sustainable public transport infrastructure in place.
- Jobs in Thornbury are poor quality, low wage. Better quality employment is needed before more housing is built.
- Options 4 and 6 offer closest proximity to the town centre.
- Option 5 has poor access to the town centre due to current road layout.
- Any development along Morton Way would be detrimental to Thornbury as it could encourage future expansion towards the A38.
- Walking times stated do not seem accurate.
- Any possible land swap scenario concerning the Castle School must be transparent from the outset.
- Unclear as to why a breach of Morton Way is a disadvantage when this area is not Green Belt.
• Residents will use the A38 wherever housing is situated, not just if located along Morton Way.
• Unclear as to impact on Medieval fish ponds if Option 6 is chosen.
• Any application by Tesco to expand should be refused.
• More start-up premises should be made available in the town centre.
• Morton Way boundary should not be breached as it could lead to future expansion towards the A38 and would increase car use. The land is also good quality farmland.
• If development is to benefit the town centre then it needs to be close to it.
• The Castle School would benefit from being located on a single site and if finance was made available for reconstruction.
• Strong competition from Tesco, the Mall and internet shopping.
• Schools should be supported and further improved.
• Oldbury power station should be supported to preserve local jobs.
• Supermarkets attract people from outside the town.
• Pressure for food to be grown locally will increase and so will demand for allotments.
• A retirement complex should be built which could help to free-up larger properties in the town.
• Community centres, spaces for younger people and tree planting should all be supported.
• The high street should be pedestrianised allowing customers to stroll and shop.
• It would take longer than 10 minutes to walk to the town centre from Option 6.
• Development that is in close proximity to the A38 could be considered an advantage as this would reduce car trips through the town.
• Increasing oil prices due to declining supplies will begin to impact on people's lives within the Core Strategy period, but the vision for Thornbury does not currently reflect this.
• More (and an increased range of) jobs will be needed locally as car travel will become more difficult due to high fuel prices. Local food production and sale will become an increased requirement. Thus the vision should seek to provide for the day to day needs of all of its residents.
• If higher fuel costs discourage car use by 2026 then car parks are potential development land.
• Pedestrianisation of the high street (or it becoming a shared space) would emphasise a move to a low carbon economy.
• Some housing provision for younger and older people is possibly needed. Location of such housing in relation to shops and services should be key in determining where provision should be.
• There should be more infilling to raise densities and discourage car use.
• Higher grade agricultural land should be protected.
• If development occurs on the northern or eastern fringes then densities should be high enough to make improved public transport viable.
• The current lop-sided nature of Thornbury, with the high street to the west, should not be exacerbated.
• The former railway line should be safeguarded.
• Suggest amending vision as follows: Thornbury will be a thriving and socially cohesive market town with a diverse range of employment opportunities enabling many of its residents to work within the town. The vibrant historic town centre will provide a range of facilities which meet the day to day needs of its residents and workers, as well as its surrounding villages and farming communities. Such new housing development permitted will consist of smaller, affordable homes, and will be reasonably close to appropriate employment and the town centre. All new developments will be highly energy efficient and will not occupy good quality agricultural land.
• High quality smaller dwellings could encourage the elderly to free-up existing family housing.
• Essential to maintain free parking in the town centre is essential in encouraging people to visit.
• Need a mix of uses in the town centre.
• More employment is needed to encourage self-containment.
• Increased allotment provision should form part of the strategy for Thornbury.
• Increased allotment provision should form part of the strategy for Thornbury.
• Pavement surfaces need to be improved for the elderly and disabled.
• Tree planting programmes needed for carbon offsetting.
• Increased level of services for the elderly are needed.
• There should have been a declaration of interest from those involved in the workshop i.e. any interests any individuals or companies have in any of the sites under discussion.
• Agree with the draft vision for the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy.
• There needs to be consideration given to parking in the town centre. Park and ride scheme should be investigated. Many spaces are taken up by those who work in Thornbury who could use such a scheme.
• Closing one of the primary schools could free up a development site within the town, close to facilities.
• Re-building of the Castle School and the Sixth form centre should be fully funded under Partnerships for Schools by central government.
• The expansion of schools to provide other facilities or courses may not be centrally funded but this should be considered along with all educational facilities within South Gloucs and the cost should not be borne by the expansion of Thornbury housing.
• Consider increased pre-school provision to retain and attract jobs to Thornbury.
• The map which was used for the workshop is inaccurate in certain respects. The six potential sites are not clearly identified by field boundaries, proposed housing densities and the options are therefore misleading.
• There is no indication as to how the 6 options have been selected. Midland Way should also be considered as an option.
• There was a town survey in 2008 about the level of development that people supported but the results have not been published.
• Wider consideration is required of the final impact of any significant development on the town e.g. traffic, noise, schools, sports facilities, public spaces, etc.
• Emphasis should be on local services for local people in preference to for visitors, in order to increase self-containment.
• Any housing should be close to the town centre.
• Development should include communal land suitable for allotments/livestock.
• More cycle facilities and local buses required.
• Support vision, but question the tense in which it is written.
• The priority for Thornbury should be increased employment, not housing.
• No more than 500 houses should be built.
• Best options are 4, 5 and 6.
• The town’s self-containment should be maximised to avoid exacerbating congestion on the A38 and motorway junctions.
• Options 1 to 3 are likely to worsen flood risk and increase traffic on the A38.
• Increased cycle lane provision in Thornbury is required.
• A small increase in the town’s population may help increase trade.
• Do not support development adjacent to Morton Way
• Oldbury power station development could provide better drainage for Thornbury development.
• Any development must be as close as possible to the town centre.
• The council should investigate potential for land along Midland Way for development.
• Thornbury needs more residential development and I support the Area two site
• Option 1: Too far from shops/amenities, pylons on-site, no outer boundary to contain development.
• Option 2: Close to schools and local shops, contained by existing roads, potential for improved sewerage for existing dwellings.
• Option 3: As for option 1, also SNCIs in this location.
- Option 4: Green Belt, isolated from other existing housing development, highway safety poor, flooding.
- Option 5: Green Belt, impact on landscape and historical character, highway safety concerns.
- Option 6: Highway safety concerns, prone to flooding, housing development and school expansion would cause a loss of amenity to local residents.
- Do not support more housing in Thornbury.
- Options 1, 2, 3 and 6 are all too far from the town centre.
- Option 4 is in the Green Belt and potentially suffers from drainage problems.
- The vision should include greater consideration of local food production, public transport and support for local business so that the town can support itself.

**Highways Agency**
- Any future plans for development at Thornbury must take the impact of the strategic road network into account, particularly at Junctions 14 and 16 of the M5 and Junction 1 of the M48.
- Any development must be fully integrated with the provision of transport infrastructure.
- Recommend that the vision makes reference to the need for development to contribute to increased self-containment.
- Would welcome reference in the vision to enhancing public transport provision as well as improving cycling/pedestrian routes within the town linking residents with employment/shops/services.
- Agency wishes to see a mix of uses promoted to encourage self-containment.
- A full assessment of the impact on the strategic road network should accompany any of the options coming forward.
- Options 1, 2 and 3 are outside of a convenient walking distance to shops and services which in combination to close proximity to the A38 may encourage car use. Area 3 is not in convenient walking distance of the health centre or Castle School.
- Options 4, 5 & 6 have excellent/reasonable access to services. Development should occur in those locations that support sustainable communities and encourage sustainable transport choices.
- Support higher densities in and around areas with good public transport links.
- Future development of Oldbury Power Station must be taken into account during any assessment on the impact of development on the strategic road network, especially J14 of the M5.

**Oldbury on Severn Parish Council**
- Concerns regarding flooding/drainage impact on Oldbury as a result of further development at Thornbury.
- Concerned that SuDS will not be adequate to reduce increased flood risk to Oldbury homes.
- Cost of improving water management at Oldbury should be borne by developers.
- More sustainable transport infrastructure is required before development takes place.
- Improvements to infrastructure and services in Thornbury are required.

**Thornbury Town Council**
- Support the Council’s approach
- Support need for 500-1000 new dwellings in order to support local shops, schools and services and to address demographic shifts that have occurred.
- Option 6 is most suitable. Do not support a breach of Morton Way or encroachment into the Green Belt.
- Support re-development of hospital site for improved health services. Also support provision of extra care housing in Thornbury – possibly on any land freed by hospital development.
- Support strengthened community facilities
• Castle School needs to update its accommodation and should be supported by SGC to do so either on both its present sites or by rebuilding all on the Park Road site. Should the present Gloucester Rd site be vacated it could be developed either for housing, extra care housing or community facilities.
• Increased allotment provision required.
• An increase in local residents would help town centre viability.
• Support additional employment.
• Increased nursery provision required.

Sustainable Thornbury
• Climate change and resource pressure have not been given adequate attention in the vision so far.
• Alternative vision suggested: Thornbury will be a thriving and socially cohesive market town supporting itself and the surrounding farms and villages. The Thornbury area will provide the goods, services and facilities to satisfy day-to-day needs of its residents and they will only need to look outside for longer-term or more specialist needs. The facilities and opportunities provided will be such as to sustainably match the population and demographics of the Thornbury area. All residents will be able to participate in, and have pride in, their community. The town centre will have built on its rich historic character and setting and will be promoting itself as an attraction, a centre for the arts and an exciting place to shop.
• More employment in Thornbury is needed, not more housing.
• Concentrating facilities in the Town centre, rather than distributing them through the town and villages may not be compatible with reducing private transportation and may lead to social isolation as the demographic changes.
• There is no need to consider building houses in order potentially to keep all local school places filled. It would be possible to use redundant schools sites for affordable housing or housing designed to encourage elderly people to move from larger homes.
• Other potential development sites could be car parks if personalised transport becomes less popular
• Any housing which may be built should be of the highest standard (sustainable home level 6) in order to provide energy efficient houses for the future. Micro-generation should be considered as standard.
• Consideration could be given to the possibility of setting aside land for self-builders as a way of meeting affordable housing demands.
• If numerous houses are built in one area, the design should be of the eco-village type where cars are kept outside the pedestrian friendly housing (examples exist in Stroud locally).
• Higher density housing, plus the anticipated need to produce more local food, means that every development should have its own allotment provision close by.
• Housing for the elderly should be of a variety of types but should all be near to services to enable residents to be part of community life.

DLP Planning
• Support option 4.

Pegasus Planning LLP
• Support option 6, circa 500 dwellings – masterplan supplied.

Barton Willmore
• Support option 3 – masterplan supplied.

Voyce Pullin, agent
• Promotion of land to north of Butt Lane for consideration.
Appendix 7 - Yate and Chipping Sodbury Workshop One, June 2009

In 2009 the Council held two workshops in Yate and Chipping Sodbury as part of the Core Strategy process. The workshops were used as an opportunity to ask the local community how they would like to see Yate and Chipping Sodbury develop over the next 15-20 years.

Purpose of the workshops

Over 300 local organisations and community representatives were invited to act as a ‘focus group’ to enable the Council to understand what the local community want to achieve through the Core Strategy document between now and 2026.

The first workshop held in June 2009 reviewed the results of a wider public consultation in 2008 at which people were asked to identify issues and options for change in the area where they live. The workshop then considered the needs of the existing community and was asked to think about how the community needed to change and improve. The discussion was grouped under these themes:

- Where I participate – Community
- Where I live – Housing
- Where I relax – Leisure
- Where I shop – Retail
- Where I work and learn – Employment and Education

Transport issues were considered under each heading. A summary of the comments made during Workshop One can be found below.

Where I participate – Community

- Community facilities should act as a focal point for new housing.
- There is a need for expanded health facilities, which in turn may create more employment.
- Green spaces have the potential to bring people together in their use and management. E.g. ‘friends of’ groups.
- New growth could bring facilities that aren’t currently provided.
- Yate & C/S have some exceptional facilities and highly valued green spaces: Stub Ridings, Brimsham Park (particularly for fishing, but could do with disabled access/platforms), Kingsgate Park, the skate park, 13 play equipped areas.
- Community centres best near other facilities (shops)
- New facilities should be ‘multi-use’ to cater for all age groups, but especially the young. Young people should be involved in planning new facilities.
- Could more use be made of schools for the wider community?
- Local management/ownership of facilities is needed. Yate & C/S do have active Town Councils and other community organisations that with civic leadership should be prepared to take on the management of new facilities.
- Yate Centre is a cultural desert, lacking an evening economy and any community facilities.
- Quality of town centre is not inviting and private management of Yate centre probably does not help with providing community uses.
- Yate & C/S are great places to live, but it is not immediately evident why. The vision needs to help sell Yate more.
Where I live – Housing

- Yate & Chipping Sodbury are distinct places. This distinctiveness should be reinforced.
- Public transport connections (particularly the railway) are very important for the vitality of residential areas.
- Growth has implications for existing transport, social & education facilities. New infrastructure should be delivered in step with new growth.
- Buses are important, as even though there are good walking and cycling links these are not often convenient for elderly, people with shopping & small children etc.
- Housing should be flexible, i.e. able accommodate changing needs.
- Shortage of ‘affordable’ homes for young people. But don’t necessarily mean that we want more social rent.
- Development should incorporate a mix of housing types.
- Yate has excellent foot and cycle connections which should be reinforced and expanded into the growth areas.
- Car dominance is a problem in some estates.
- Connectivity (visual and physical) to green space is very important to the quality of housing areas and the health & well-being of the people who live there.
- New housing should be eco-friendly.
- New areas should provide for some self build plots as part of the mix of housing.
- Employment uses should be ‘mixed’ into new housing areas, not necessarily zoned as has been done in the past.
- What could Yate/CS unique selling point be? Access to IT, homeworking, broadband hub – this would also assist with reducing traffic and retain people in the town during the day.
- Connection to green space and informal play opportunities is vital for Health & Wellbeing.
- There is a real north/south divide around the dual carriageway in south Yate. This needs breaking down.

Where I relax – Leisure

- Access from new houses to open space to be easy.
- Consider area as a whole for network of green spaces etc Pocket pieces of land not suitable – more useful to have large spaces.
- Young people need things to do in the evenings. Lots of places are locked.
- Involve people in the design.
- Draw on successes skate parks, Kingsgate Park. Improve what we’ve got to increase use. Protect YOSC, commons, Ridings.
- New areas to provide accessible informal provision. Provide larger single spaces, not small. Planning strategies for onsite/offsite provision.
- Evening economy in Yate and Chipping Sodbury – 18-30’s, Cinema, Bowling Alley, Restaurants.
- Indoor leisure facilities – is there enough?
- Network of open spaces linked to countryside Well used spaces in the towns.
- Green spaces are a selling point of the towns. Joining up needs to be done with substantial green links, not bits.
- Should be able to use the schools facilities for leisure. Would take the pressure off the leisure centres.
- Expand the River Frome Walkway. Make convenient links to it from North and South Yate. Link to the shopping centre, as an open space resource. Continue east west link to Chipping Sodbury.
- General shortage of pitches. YOSC will need extending to cope with new development. Children want easy access to local pitches so they can be independent and get there easily from home.
- Protect the ridge of Yate Rocks.
- In new development protect green space.
- Wellbeing from greenness. The open spaces are important particularly to people who are stuck in an area. Important to make a nice environment and a strong community in the future – network of both.
• Built facilities – a need for an arts venue – flexible space so it can be used for exhibitions, performances, linked to re-energising night life in Yate. Sea stores and the overflow car park could provide this opportunity
• No evening economy in Yate
• The roads in the towns are major barriers to easy walking and cycling movements
• There needs to be connectivity between buildings, outdoor spaces and the way their uses flow together in a complementary way

Where I shop – Retail

• Need a balance of roles for Yate and Chipping Sodbury. Yate and Chipping Sodbury are two different centres but must complement each other. Yate = mainstream national retailers, comparison, convenience goods. Chipping Sodbury = niche independents. Reinforce roles.
• Bulky goods not necessarily in shopping centre. Can’t get bulky goods in Yate/Sodbury – need to extend choice and should use some of the industrial estate for this Consider Stover Rd.
• Yate needs more floorspace to increase offer. Qualitative larger units. Yate could offer a lot more - diversify – bring in the national shops. Size of units is too small to attract them as – redesign. More choice of location.
• Make Yate and Chipping Sodbury more attractive to people outside towns as well as within. Leakage to Bristol North Fringe. Retail study says people from Yate tend to shop in Longwell Green. Also Cribbs sees Yate as potential competition as the footfall is high although time spent in centre is less.
• Public transport – Retail centres need better links with bus routes. Links across South Glos eg Yate to Thornbury, also to services such as hospitals. Local transport needs to link with places want to go- eg shopping centre, station, places of work. Don’t forget rural locations
• Need other facilities to support Yate such as night time economy and arts venue. Owners of the centre promised to improve nightlife – not been delivered, but needs to happen. People want a choice of things to do in the evenings. The pubs cater for kids rather than a mix of people. Want a more sociable mix.
• Internet shopping ok but people do want to see and touch before ordering
• Rents in the centre of towns are too high
• Need to extend opening hours to accommodate evening shoppers and to add vitality
• Station Rd needs to bump up its retail offer to link town with station – needs to be more attractive and not be broken up by housing
• Boost tourism and give people a reason to come to Ch Sodbury eg Book Town
• The role of Ch Sodbury tends to support farming community. Interest in Ch. Sodbury is high, but needs a critical mass of shoppers to really attract new shops.
• New development needs local retail support, takeaways, hairdressers, café, pubs etc. But family based. Walkable.
• Planning conditions can unfairly restrict re-use of properties and don’t make it easy to change with the times. Need flexibility in the offer and in the building design to change with times
• Think about distance from offices/Industrial estate to centres – need quicker links – community bike hire available?
• Recognise that change is necessary to keep a place alive.

Where I work and learn - Employment and Education

• Major issue as we understand it is the out-commuting to work to Bristol and other areas, and in-commuting to industrial estates creating congestion. How can we address this?
• Yate/Sodbury has an image problem with potential employers who might base themselves here. Market research – what are the gaps at present?
• Role of home working is understated and could be prioritised – changing work patterns, wifi networks, office-related infrastructure provided by local support Home working has become more significant and important over the past few years. Largely due to improvements in broadband, connection and emails.
• Support services not quite there, the area is not set-up for large scale growth.
• Alleged lack of aspiration in towns – how to change the culture? New housing to be aspirational in terms of how it functions? Work from home, community support, technological support.

• Need for traditional employment units but also new, ‘home grown’, small-scale industries supporting home working – promoting offices, full integration of businesses within residential development.

• How to address competition from SPark and proposed development in east fringe of Bristol – recognise the type of employment needed, importance of transport links.

• Lack of business incubator space in the area. It is an excellent location for small, technology-enabled rather than technology-based businesses. Scope to grow from within with small-scale changes.

• There is a mismatch between local skills and local employment. That is why there is out-migration/commuting to Bristol and Bath. This creates inefficiencies in transport, ecology, and social

• Transition between education and industry needs improving – increased local 6th form/college provision, ‘3rd age’ education facilities

• How will education facilities function? – combined facilities between schools?

• Accessing educational facilities – improve routes between schools, reduce dependence on the car.

• Importance of training (both education and vocational) and recognising available skills in the area – type of employment to relate to population, emphasis on future generations? Lack of higher education in Yate. People moving out of Yate for career/further education progression.

• Low profile of existing schools – potential to re-brand, emphasise rural location and build on its location (agricultural schools etc).

• Potential/need for 6th form level education/college

• Building on existing facilities.

• Potential/need for social enterprise – different offer/specialisation in higher education/technical colleges.

• Schools to the south of Yate centre have declining enrolment. Development in urban extensions to the north of Yate will not help stabilise schools across the town.

• To have a good educational offer we need to work in partnership with other colleges such as Filton to provide a full range of courses and facilities.

• Also there is the issue of how to travel to, from and between schools. Are existing cycle/pedestrian routes adequate?

• Public transport needs addressing – potential for ‘Yate 8’? Adequate access and potential for schools combining resources relies on public transport that links all parts of Yate/Sodbury. It needs to be: local, frequent and cheap.

• In the short term are there routes for walking and other forms of transport. Are they safe, green, connected routes?

• Need to reduce car usage on the school run.

• Transport corridors are required to service all uses. Both new routes and retrofitting existing ones where necessary. Ideally we would not be using cars at all.
Appendix 8: Yate and Chipping Sodbury Workshop Two, November 2009

Purpose of the workshop
This event was the follow-up to the June 2009 workshop event. Over 300 local organisations and community representatives were invited to act as a ‘focus group’ to enable the Council to understand what the local community want to achieve through the Core Strategy document between now and 2026. The workshop participants were asked to consider which of the spatial areas identified in the RSS performed best in achieving the stated vision and strategic objectives for the towns. The participants used the South Gloucestershire sustainability appraisal framework as a basis for evaluating the areas. The Sustainability Appraisals cover the following topics.

- **Promoting good Health and Wellbeing** – opportunities to improve health, reduce health inequalities and promote healthy lifestyles through well designed environments and access to leisure, health, social and community facilities.
- **Supporting the Community’s needs** – providing a range of housing, access to learning, training, skills and knowledge, reduction of crime and fear of crime, promoting stronger and more vibrant communities, providing access to and participation in cultural activities.
- **Promoting Economic Development** – access to a wider range of jobs, achieving a comfortable standard of living, reducing poverty, meeting local needs locally, reduce vulnerability of local economy to external factors and harness opportunities.
- **Providing good Access and Transport** – help everyone to access services easily safely and affordably, make public transport, cycling and walking easier and more attractive, reduce travel distances to jobs and services.
- **Sustaining Environmental quality and assets** – maintain and enhance cultural and historic assets, landscape and townscape, value and sustain local distinctiveness and diversity, protect and enhance species and habitats, promote the conservation and wise use of land, reduce vulnerability to flooding.
- **Minimising the Use and Abuse of Natural Resources** – minimise waste, minimise extraction and consumption of finite natural resources, reduce non-renewable energy consumption and harness renewable natural resources, minimise all forms of pollution, take account of the future impacts of climate change.

**Stover Road**

- Agree it should stay as an employment site, but should be regenerated and improved. Alternate uses could include high quality offices of all size, flexible, small start up with 5000 sq ft, bulky goods, comparison goods, retail, hotel.
- Close to train station. Bus links to Yate and Thornbury. However, need to make better transport links across town. Improve links with station/Yate centre/new development.
- Bigger employment premises. Potential for flexible uses, bigger retail and bulky goods.
- Gateway to Yate – improve. Think about improving the station rd corridor.
- Quality of estate changes across site. Scope to improve the appearance of the entrance to Yate using office development.
- Affordable premises.
- Better use of land – not so much left over space. Encourage more green space. River Frome walkway is good for health/wellbeing. Take fingers of green into estate.
- Warehousing not lots of jobs per sq ft.
- Retain some B class. Develop range and quality of economic choice.
- Rejuvenate to support community needs.
- Minimise pollution and maximise potential for use of natural resources.
- Need to protect Frome corridor and improve buffering from surrounding land uses.
- Flooding at Stover Bridge.
- Stover Bridge entrance a problem. Stover bridge too small and access to site poor for HGV’S.
- Very positive to focus on regeneration of employment area. Improving the employment offer + enhance gateway setting for Yate and River Frome corridor very important. Transport issues...
must be addressed, especially HGV movements. A wider strategic view would be helpful to set
down key principles for other employment areas in locality.
• Existing impact on surrounding roads and neighbourhoods from HGV traffic.
• Discourage distribution type uses.
• More mixed development may help reduceout commuting from Yate.
• Might it help get a better balance of the local economy – a higher quality of employment? Is
there an opportunity to bring in such uses in this area? Could there be a higher intensity of
use?
• Transport issues need addressing. The train station is close, but only small trains stop there,
infrequently. Increasing the number of train services might make it more usable.

Land at Engine Common

• It is close to the train station, but limited for access to other public transport. The existing
access to transport from the site is not good and the scale of the development would not
provide an opportunity to improve the situation.
• There is a pedestrian link to the station but this is not an attractive safe route.
• Number of sites of local conservation importance. Wildflower meadows would be at risk. It is
difficult to preserve them when they are built around. Good access to the Frome Valley
walkway. Access to countryside is good.
• Engine Common has some existing facilities in North Road, e.g. post office, pub, school. Site
has not got the scale to be able to provide facilities for future residents on site.
• Has no public open space. All land surrounding the site is privately owned land, some of which
has public footpaths across it.
• Railway is seen as the divide between Yate and is very important to the existing communities.
However, extending development over this boundary would upset local residents.
• Railway line is a barrier limited crossings available existing facilities, schools and open space
are on the other side. The site is a long way from cultural facilities. The only local social space
is within the football club which has a bar.
• Easy access to jobs but at the moment all the local employment opportunities are low paid.
Developing this land would mean taking away some existing jobs.
• Junction works needed on North Rd etc. small scale development couldn’t provide this
• The area floods. Waste water/ sewage services aren’t good enough now. With added
development they will be worse
• Coal mine shafts and associated tunnelling throughout the site. Number of historical mine sites
within the area of search.
• Could help to support existing local community facilities and create a village heart. High density
would be out of character with the area. Low density might be more appropriate.
• Good hedges and trees and small field sizes give character and encourage small scale
development.
• Established village separate to Yate General comments expressed concern areas being
promoted too big, feels too much like unco-ordinated sprawl away from Yate. Engine Common
is a separate/ existing community and their local identity should be respected and not
‘absorbed’ into Yate.
• Rural nature and character of location + severance created by railway line limits development
opportunities and effective integration with existing fabric of Yate. 
• Limited access is a constraint. Some opportunities to strengthen employment provision and
like to existing facilities.
• Size and scale of development would limit opportunity to provide range of renewable/
decentralised energy measures.

Land at North Brimsham

• Having a large development like this would mean that no other development is necessary in
the area.
• More appropriate to link it to a larger town.
• The size would mean more investment in services and facilities
• Need to link Peg Hill and N Brimsham to get comprehensive dev
• Access – need to improve and handle traffic
• Issues of flooding
• Pylons – health issue, visual issue
• Small Tesco or local centre needed
• Distance to Yate Centre
• Needs some employment/small business opps Could provide some on site- mixed development.
• Yate outdoor sports, existing footpaths and Brinsham Fields give opportunities for recreation. Excellent community facilities at YOSC with opportunity to enhance/improve.
• Long distance from Yate town centre. Would need bus link and cycle links.
• Feels like a dead end. Would a link to the east help this, make a more connected place?
• Concern over capacity of surrounding road network to take a substantial increase in traffic arising from a large development.
• Need to restrict access to Tanhouse Lane to preserve its character.
• Would need to provide its own facilities due to distance from Yate town centre; doctor’s, school, shops.
• Good network of footpaths provides access to countryside.
• Suburban nature of existing development at North Brimsham may hinder car movements giving rise to congestion. Form of development needs to carefully consider how strategic movement is addressed.
• Location is relatively featureless. Some local flooding issues need addressing. Also opportunity to afford ‘protection’ to Yate Rocks and Peg Hill corridor and ridgeline which is much valued as creating a setting for Yate/Sodbury.
• Size and scale of development would provide opportunity to provide range of renewable/decentralised energy measures.
• Quite high potential for this area. Scale of development could help to generate potential community benefits
• Where will the ‘transport’ go? Quite isolated in relation to Yate centre. Would need to create it’s own centre as people are unlikely to walk as far as the existing town centre.
• It’s possible to look at this area and Yate Rocks as one. Quarry in Yate Rocks area provides a natural boundary for development. Anything beyond starts to impact on high quality landscape
• Benefits of creating dual access (from North Brinsham and Yate Rocks/Peg Hill) would be good. Specifically a bus service that could link in with the rest of Yate.
• Sustainability of the road network would not be feasible at all. Just adding to congestion on Goose Green Way.
• Public transport provision in the north of Yate is disproportionately bad in relation to the south
• Whatever happens development needs to generate a bus network
• Potential for alternative methods of transport? Car clubs for example?

**Land at Peg Hill**

• Noise issues regarding Quarry operations currently receive complaints from existing residents regarding noise heavy goods traffic and dust
• As this is a small site can’t easily provide a good mix of housing and facilities.
• Some access potential to a primary school if one was to be built on the Heron land
• Poor access to facilities and reduced access to retail
• Poor access to employment opportunities
• Small site reduced option to provide employment on site.
• No existing bus routes near the site
• There is existing footpath access through woods to Chipping Sodbury
• Need to defend the scarp slope visually this slope is very dominating building housing up this slope would give the impression that the housing goes on for ever and have a detrimental effect on the character of the area. We would prefer the slope to remain green
• There is a flood risk on the site the land is known as the mashes.
• Yate Rocks needs protecting as they are visually important
• Size is a constraint
• Needs to be looked at in conjunction with N Brinsham
• Stay away from landscape sensitive areas
• Very difficult to see how this standalone development location makes any wider positive benefits to Yate/Sodbury other than simply providing more housing. No wider benefits forthcoming and in fact disbenefits – impact on setting, ridgeline, compromise Peg Hill all out weight housing gain. This location only performs if seen as part of a more comprehensive development.
• Benefits of creating dual access (from North Brinsham and Yate Rocks/Peg Hill) would be good. Specifically a bus service that could link in with the rest of Yate.
• It is on a strategic route between Brimsham Park and Chipping Sodbury. As such it has access to the lanes and cycle friendly routes.
• Smaller site – no community facilities but Peg Hill centre not too far. YR nearer Tesco, GP, Take-away, skate park very well used, Public House. Closer to identifies with Wickwar. Southern end more sustainable location.

Land at Barnhill Quarry

• Located close to Chipping Sodbury High Street, this site could impact on local shops, but it could also bring in trade to the area. It would provide additional employment, so should score similar to Engine Common. It has achieved a degree of local acceptance, from the community standpoint.
• You can walk into town, and to the Stub Ridings and Ridge Wood.
• The development opens up access to the quarry that can only be glimpsed at present.
• Access/ transport – good access to leisure/ recreation/ retail
• Need to ensure that this site would relate sensitively to Ridge Wood. Ridge Wood is on its way to becoming a SSSI and is currently an area of local conservation
• Development has proposed open space this would have to be done in a way which enhances Ridgewood
• Locating the higher density housing next to Ridgewood and away from the proposed onsite open space will have a negative impact on Ridgewood re anti social behaviour.
• Lake equals danger
• Quarry is far enough away so future residents would not be affected by noise or dust
• Good footpaths and cycle ways
• Good pedestrian access to existing primary school
• Provision for small independent businesses on site
• Food retail unit would provide a source of employment
• Well located to make use of buss routes serving Chipping Sodbury including bus route to the train station
• Has potential but questions around how it related to existing important views to church and houses should not be visible above the scarp and ridge line.
• Not enough scale for use of renewable energy on a large scale however could look into geothermal
• Common land and flooding are issues. Existing flood area is a problem Quarry is pumped to keep water levels low
• Health services are in Yate
• Poorer access to main employment area in east Yate
• Mix of house types including affordable housing. Concern that high cost of building on reclaimed land may effect profitability and therefore amount of affordable housing offered.

Land East of Chipping Sodbury – Park Farm Area

• Community needs – could be met if large enough. Probably wouldn’t want to put a local centre that would compete with Chipping Sodbury Town centre so close. Some of the site close enough to Chipping Sodbury town centre
• Economic Development – PT needed to access employment in Yate
• Limited health facilities in Chipping Sodbury. What is scope to deliver own health facilities? Good access to the countryside, but less to the urban area.
• East Chipping Sodbury has access to main roads. The site should incorporate employment opportunities
• Poor access to existing employment
• It was a medieval deer park so would have some historical value from that. Does this have a bearing? It starts to join Chipping Sodbury to Old Sodbury.
• The River Frome goes all the way round the site. Flooding
• The land is also on the rise so it would be a prominent development.
• Would need to provide its own primary school
• Poor access into Yate town, Chipping Sodbury has no where to do a large food shop so future residents will go to Yate.
• Will need to be a mixed site with employment and health facilities
• The site is proposing an extra care scheme which would be good for the community
• The affordable housing needs access to a range of shops
• No public transport to serve residents
• Poor access for all traffic, all traffic has to travel around Smarts Green and back in
• Sustainable transport links would need to be improved
• The area floods
- The development would be harmful to Sodbury Common AONB
- Stub ridings is more visually open and development here would have a greater visual impact
- Too big a development, disproportionate to the scale of Chipping Sodbury. It would transform the character into something undesirable.
- It would contribute nothing but traffic to the town.
- Greenfield site
- Proximity and impact on AONB
- Larger size of development allows for heating by biomass fuel.
- Strong concerns expressed about impact on AONB. This could be addressed by establishing a long term green boundary. However, development would still have an impact where currently there is none. Therefore principal of development needs to be fully considered. Localised flooding at St John’s Way could also be addressed by series of balancing ponds.
Appendix 9 - North Fringe Workshop Report

Report of the Stakeholder Workshops held on 2nd December 2009 at the UWE Exhibition and Conference Centre to consider a Vision and Aims for the Bristol North Fringe for the period to 2026.

Introduction

This report summarises the outcomes of workshops held on 2nd December 2009 to consider a vision and aims for the North Fringe of Bristol for the period to 2026.

The workshops were held in the new Exhibition and Conference Centre at the University of the West of England. The workshops were held over two sessions (morning and evening) and were by invitation to key stakeholder organisations. A list of organisations which were represented is reproduced at Appendix 1.

Both workshop sessions were introduced by Mike Luton, Senior Principal Planning Officer based within the Council’s Major Sites Team. He welcomed participants and introduced John Rushforth – Deputy Vice Chancellor at the University who outlined emerging proposals for the enlarged UWE Campus and welcomed participants to the major new conference facilities.

Mike Luton then gave a brief presentation which outlined the Council’s task which is to prepare the Core Strategy Development Plan Document which will guide development in the period to 2026. Delegates were asked to consider:

Where are we now? – How does the area look and function at present?
Where do we want to be? – What are the appropriate vision and aims for the area?
How do we get there? – What needs to be done to ensure that the aims are met?

The Bristol North Fringe can be considered in three broad sub areas:

North Fringe South – from Filton through to the M32 including the UWE and Stoke Gifford areas – this is a potential area of change and therefore a focus of the workshop session.
North Fringe West - around Patchway, Cribbs Causeway and the airfield. This too is a potential area of change and a focus of the workshop.
Bradley Stoke – The new town which has become established over the past twenty years and where there was less scope for further change and therefore was not subject of detailed consideration in the workshop.

A draft Vision had been prepared for discussion based on earlier consultations. The Council would welcome feedback on that and on draft Strategic Objectives which had also been put forward. The workshops then broke into group work based around the South and West areas. The feedback from Group Work is summarised below.

Workshop Feedback

Task 1 – Where are we now?

a) Identify the key parts of the area which you feel are fixed and those where you
think change is possible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed: - Areas perceived to have little scope for change for 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• All infrastructure – railways / stations / motorways/ ring road / airfield.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employment Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Large employment sites in single ownership – MOD, UWE, Bristol Business Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Airfield/Airbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Mall and Cribbs Causeway Retail park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Patchway, Henbury, Catbrain Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Northfield / Charlton Hayes, Wallscourt Fm development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greenbelt and Green Infrastructure – Sims Hill, Stoke Park, M32 corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Aztec West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Filton High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential areas of change:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Large warehouse sheds – could provide intensification / diversification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Land south of Airfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UWE &amp; Land East of Coldharbour Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Patchway Trading Estate – could be better used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Land west of A4018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Area around Cribbs estate &amp; car parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Filton Golf Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Abbey Wood Retail Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Areas of Search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• B&amp;Q / Sainsburys at Fox Den Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Frenchay Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M32 corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rolls Royce East Works – for mixed uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Axa – Green spaces – public access, Car parks – deck and redevelop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Road corridors – design as green corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rapid Transit route through Harry Stoke and Stoke Gifford Transport Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New Centre for Patchway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rebalancing of communities and improved community facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Broaden role and mix of uses at The Mall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve permeability of the Cribbs Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Henbury Trym area – protect and enhance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Forest of Avon and Haw’s Wood – improved pedestrian access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need enhanced sport and leisure offer and better links from residential areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Map any major good or bad points about the area – e.g. places you enjoy and places you don’t

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major good points/places/strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Strong employment base and economic output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Good skills base and well paid jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UWE – provides a strong draw and new opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strategic access to key transport links (Parkway, Abbey Wood Station and Motorways/main roads) (although local access generally poor e.g. local access to stations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strong community in older areas such as Patchway &amp; Filton (community centres well used)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Good access to green space and quick access to the countryside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Long Wood / Hermitage Wood/ Haw’s Wood, Dings site, Sims Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M32 Landscape corridor / Stoke Park (but setting at risk from Park and Ride),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GBBN &amp; Cycle City improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• It’s a collection of small communities
• Sports facilities and playing fields
• The mall – local community is proud of it – enhanced future role

Major bad points/places/weaknesses
• Railway diamond.
• Traffic / congestion general and at motorway junctions – grid lock with accidents
• Severence caused by railways and roads (fixed infrastructure) – Bus lanes will make it worse
• Insular / campus style developments, e.g. AXA, MoD, UWE, Cribbs (Mall)
• Area car oriented. Whole area is not sustainable.
• In Commuting
• Lacks identity – tension with Bristol
• Lack of housing
• Access to Rail Stations on foot is a problem.
• Lack of local retail and other community facilities (e.g. in Stoke Park).
• Poor public realm
• UWE – Student Parking issue
• UWE – Access to facilities is not easy
• Lack of strategic link to Yate / Sodbury
• Lack of distinct neighbourhood centres or a central High Street
• Lack of sports provision
• Poor co-ordination with Bristol City.
• ‘Arrival’ at Parkway is very poor experience.
• Walk route to UWE is poor and badly lit.
• Poor bus services.
• Little to do after work
• Facilities at Patchway are poor and ageing.
• Fighting to save communities – local shops closed following Mall opening
• Very little for young people to do
• Henbury/Brent are limited facilities and poor link to Cribbs – Bristol CC look to consolidate links to central Bristol
• Access to GP services – UWE GP only open to students. GP for Harry Stoke planned to be at Stoke Gifford – access issues.
• Frenchay Hospital – scope for community hospital and nature reserve – but access difficult
• Poor links to Lockleaze – but concerns over safety if any links intensively used.

Task 2 - Where do we want to be?
Participants were asked to consider a draft vision and to score from 1 strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree and to provide any further comments. Note not all Groups completed this task.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft Vision Statement</th>
<th>Group Score and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The North Fringe of Bristol Urban Area will continue to be a major economic driver in the West of England sub region.</td>
<td>Group Scores: 4,5,5,5,5,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide a better mix of housing and employment, number one!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Need to focus on jobs, rather than sectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Vision needs to address identity – is this Bristol or not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• This area is so closely linked with Bristol – highlight that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure that opportunities, such as the links with Lockleaze are delivered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Safeguard Airfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How do you make it “sustainable”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Agree, but not at expense of local people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Need to improve the variety of jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Play to areas strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Strategic Objectives</td>
<td>Group Score and Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Prosperity</td>
<td>Group scores: 5,5,4,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - The needs of key economic drivers in the locality (the aerospace industry, UWE, Filton Airfield and other major employers) will continue to be safeguarded and supported. | - Should aim to protect jobs – but shouldn’t be too prescriptive.  
- Shouldn’t name individual companies – flexibility in use is key.  
- This is a sub-regional issues and should be addressed as such – more joint working with Bristol.  
- Viability of airfield needs protecting.  
- Rolls Royce East Works – scope for mixed use??  
- Get housing in before jobs.  
- Will there be other small scale employment opportunities integrated with new housing.  
- Reinforce role of Higher Education |
| Town & Local Centres      | Group scores: 5,5,2or 3, 5 |
| - The Council and its partners will work to deliver greater social interaction through the provision of new local amenities and public spaces at existing centres, within new residential | - Co-location of community facilities – Libraries, meeting spaces, schools etc may assist viability.  
- Community Cohesion is important.  
- Extra Care housing needs to be included.  
- There is no real centre to the North Fringe  
- Abbeywood does not work as a centre – design and type of |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Green Infrastructure</strong></th>
<th><strong>Group Scores: 5</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing green spaces will be protected. Steps will be taken to enhance the quality and accessibility of these spaces.</strong></td>
<td><strong>• Agreed that Strategic open space is a key issue. Could dead ground in middle of railway ‘diamond’ be used more efficiently? Large area - could this be turned into a park?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific opportunities for new wildlife and amenity routes exist between 3 Brooks Nature Reserve – Harry Stoke/M32 extension – Stoke Park in the east of the North Fringe and extending from Haw Wood to the Cribbs/Filton Extension and the wider countryside in the west.</strong></td>
<td><strong>• Opportunity to provide green infrastructure links south of UWE to Bristol</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>•</strong></td>
<td><strong>• Real potential to link with the surrounding countryside to provide local food opportunities.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>•</strong></td>
<td><strong>• Links should be accessible and usable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>•</strong></td>
<td><strong>• Quality and cycle pedestrian routes required.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Access and transport</strong></th>
<th><strong>Group Scores: 5</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All new development proposals and the actions of the Council and its partners will contribute to tackling congestion by improving and encouraging people to utilise more frequently the walking, cycling and public transport networks.</strong></td>
<td><strong>• Include reference to controlling car parking and encourage car sharing.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This will be achieved in the North Fringe area, through significant investment in delivering major schemes such as the Wallscourt Farm and Romney Avenue bus links, M32-Coldharbour Lane HOV lanes, new rapid transit routes to Bristol and Emersons Green, supporting and enhancing the role of Parkway Station, Bristol Metro Rail Project and expansion of the Cycle City Project.</strong></td>
<td><strong>• Risk of North Fringe being transport led when land uses are not resolved.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>•</strong></td>
<td><strong>• Note traffic issues at Catbrain</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• New development proposals should also seek to assist reduce the dominance and</strong></td>
<td><strong>Group Scores: 5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seanhs</strong></td>
<td><strong>• Agreed that Rapid Transport – North Fringe – Hengrove Link would provide a major benefit</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>•</strong></td>
<td><strong>• Very important that congestion is addressed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>•</strong></td>
<td><strong>• Regular 30min service to Yate required.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>•</strong></td>
<td><strong>• Bus fares to high.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>•</strong></td>
<td><strong>• Integration with Lockleaze important</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>•</strong></td>
<td><strong>• Need to address community safety concerns with Romney Avenue link.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Homes
- New residential neighbourhoods will be delivered at Filton Northfield, Harry Stoke/West of M32, South of UWE, and Cribbs/Filton in order to assist ‘re-balance’ the mix of land-uses to provide the opportunity for more people to live near to where they work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group scores: 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing policy should be based on provision of numerous smaller sites and not large strategic sites – would help overcome viability issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High density may not deliver suitable family housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High density requires commitment to high quality or will fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways Agency supports redressing housing/job balance to reduce motorway congestion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University of the West of England
- An enhanced role in the community for the UWE through the provision of an expanded, modernised, integrated campus with high quality educational, cultural and leisure facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Scores: 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreed that role of UWE could be significantly enhanced – Exhibition hall could be ‘the NEC of the South West’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that the wider community links are realised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope for sporting and cultural facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be more specific on what facilities are required/proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus is currently isolated by roads etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education
- No separate objective proposed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Scores: 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education a primary draw. The area needs a ‘good’ school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Climate Change Adaptation & Mitigation
- Given the opportunity presented by the landuse mix in the North Fringe, the Council will work with its partners and developers to establish new and extend existing Combined Heat and Power Networks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Scores: 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential CHP at UWE could supply power to surrounding homes and businesses. But too much choice - consumers can’t be made to purchase power from CHP sources. Also complex legal issues which need to be understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of local food should also be mentioned – linked to Greenspace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can these aspirations actually be delivered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street trees would also assist.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task 3 – How do we get there?**
Participants were asked to consider how broad locations in your area should (or should not) be developed to contribute to the strategic objectives. If possible indicate a broad phasing plan of when areas might be developed:

- Consider smaller pockets of growth, rather than reliance on large scale sites which have proven difficult to deliver.
- Options for growth/redevelopment are needed – together with contingencies
- Open up communication links – Transport must be central to strategy
- Cribbs – introduce ‘local’ uses – too many supermarkets
- Aerospace – potential research establishment
- Potential for new centre at Harry Stoke along the transport link.
- Potential for mixed use on Coldharbour Lane site
- Open up public transport link to Lockleaze – Bristol CC.
- Not just about numbers – its about ‘placemaking’
- Must be designed for ‘people’
- Phasing – more homes before new jobs, develop permitted housing sites first, need strategy urgently otherwise planning by appeal.
Short – term - 2010 -2015

- Identify housing requirement
- Provision for housing should be based on numerous smaller sites and not large strategic sites – would help overcome viability issues
- UWE area is key area – but need to open up communication barriers – access to Lockleaze should be the first priority.
- Concord is a major international asset which could provide a major draw. The Council should be doing more to promote this as a cultural and tourist asset.
- Realise the UWE conference centres potential.
- Identify how the area can be made attractive – creation/protection of linear open space act as a connector.
- Consider the CHP potential at UWE, and how this can be linked with other areas.
- Transport Plan needs developing.
- Masterplan for Cribbs area needed before any new housing.

Medium Term - 2016 – 2020  Housing at Cribbs.

Long term - 2021 -2026  - Heavy Rail Improvements.

Other comments/feedback.

- Joined up thinking with Bristol CC needed.
- Infrastructure needed before the housing etc
- GI needs to be high quality.
- Family friendly policies required.
- Arterial routes should be street lined.
- Open up Campus Developments.
- AXA could be a real central feature if opened up.
- Ring road could become more pedestrian focussed – slow traffic
- Railway diamond could be GI or Renewable Energy resource
- Area is known as ‘Southern Brooks’
- Opportunity for community uses at Abbey Wood
- Need to link communities – not merge them!
- The Statements are too generic.
- Incremental infill is becoming a problem

Overall summary

- Overall Master Plan needed.
- Utilise Design Codes.
- Stronger Identity Required.
- Improve Cultural Facilities.
- Continue to engage the community(s).
- Civic leadership required.
- Priorities are Transport & Greenspace
- Better public realm
- Better community facilities and a local centre
- Commitment to quality
- Commitment to green infrastructure
- Reduce impact of barriers
- Flexibility in use of employment land – reduce tight zoning
Area Specific Comments
North Fringe West
Catbrain
- traffic issues in the Catbrain area
- lack of schools, facilities for kids
- anti-social behaviour issues as a result of new estate nearby
- any problems/accidents on the M5 amplify traffic issues in the locality
- residential amenity in area has been and continues to be eroded
- traffic issues in the area are having increasing effect on levels of pollution

Patchway
- fighting to maintain/sustain the community
- local shops closed since The Mall opened
- need to integrate new communities into the existing community to help support local services/community
- The Mall (fixed)
  - Existing community is proud of it
  - What does it become in the future?
  - Opportunity for a better range and integration of uses
- There are significant existing barriers to pedestrian movement in the area – important to create better linkages
- There is existing community infrastructure in place
- Rebalancing of existing community and service/facilities should precede creation of new communities
- Need for new business types to attract new people to the area
- General need to attract people and business to BNF
- How can we make the BNF more sustainable – it is inherently unsustainable
- Existing local centre needs new residents in order to sustain itself

General
- No evidence that BAe Systems have any desire to expand, in fact there is evidence that they are looking to downsize (recent trend is more towards employing people in R&D)
- Ashfield Land – interest in 3rd generation industries/R&D based development
- Very little for young people to do in the area
- Not much to do the Henbury/Brentry - very few facilities
- High skills base in BNF
- Make people proud to say they live in BNF
- Need for a new, good centre for Patchway
- Need to increase permeability
- Possibility to increase functions of The Mall to include town centre uses/facilities
- New mixed use development expected on Rolls Royce East site
- Need for more east to west links in the area
- Need for enhanced sports and leisure facilities
- BCC focus on Broadmead creates difficulties for creating new linkages from Henbury/Brentry to The Mall/Cribbs Causeway
- More linkages between residential areas and sports and leisure facilities
- Enhance/sustain Forest of Avon
- People of Catbrain want no new residential development
- Henbury Trym walkway should be maintained/safeguarded and enhanced throughout
- Good woodland west of A4108, links should be created to it
- Small retail estate (car showrooms etc) is fixed – adds a sort of sense of identity
- Include leisure uses in eastern edge of Cribbs development

**Organisations Represented at the North Fringe Workshops 2nd December 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airbus Operations Ltd</td>
<td>North Bristol NHS Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alder King Planning Consultants</td>
<td>Osborne Clarke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almondsbury Parish Council</td>
<td>Patchway Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alveston Parish Council PC</td>
<td>Persimmon Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashfield Land Ltd</td>
<td>Peter Evans Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avon Wildlife Trust</td>
<td>PJ Planning Consultants (Elev8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avril Baker Consultancy</td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAE Systems</td>
<td>Prupim (The Mall at Cribbs Causeway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Associates</td>
<td>Redrow Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton Willmore</td>
<td>RPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Sky Planning</td>
<td>Royal Society for the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovis Homes</td>
<td>Scott Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol City Council – Local Members</td>
<td>South Gloucestershire Youth Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol City Council - Strategic Planning</td>
<td>South Gloucestershire Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Zoo Gardens</td>
<td>- Local Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britel Fund Trustees (Abbey Wood Retail)</td>
<td>- Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSJ Planning</td>
<td>- Environmental Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLP Planning Ltd</td>
<td>- Housing Enabling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elev8</td>
<td>- Children and Young People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filton Community History</td>
<td>- Planning and Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVA Grimley Ltd</td>
<td>- Property Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWE Business West</td>
<td>- Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermes Real Estate</td>
<td>- Library Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways Agency</td>
<td>St Michael's CE VC Primary School (Stoke Gifford)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT Bayliss</td>
<td>Stoke Gifford Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Transport Consultants</td>
<td>Stoke Park Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Sturge</td>
<td>Strategic Land Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Salle Investment Management</td>
<td>Stride Treglown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land &amp; New Homes Countrywide</td>
<td>Terence O’Rourke Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockleaze Voice</td>
<td>Terrace Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD Abbey Wood</td>
<td>The Mall at Cribbs Causeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD Defence Estates</td>
<td>UWE - Estates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motability Operations Ltd</td>
<td>UWE – Campus Project team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>UWE - Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS South Gloucestershire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 10: Extra Care Housing event report, Dec 2009

The purpose of the seminar was to determine the views of a range of private sector providers looking at:

1. What inhibited organisations from developing extra care in South Gloucestershire
2. What sort of additional information, if any, would organisations need regarding the market
3. What sort of models of extra care housing would organisations consider

The seminar consisted of four presentations:

- Regional overview of projected increases in the older people’s population and increasing levels of need.
- South Gloucestershire’s concept of extra care.
- Overview of the Core Strategy, its key drivers and timetable.
- Increasing demand in South Gloucestershire for housing options for older people with care and support needs.

What would inhibit or encourage your organisation to develop Extracare?

Viability
- Economy of scale is vital to ensure a successful development. Development of 60/70 units as a rule of thumb is sustainable.
- The percentage of communal space is an important economic element, it is important that this reflects potential use and does not become “dead” space.
- The requirement of affordable housing is a major issue and has a major impact on viability.
- In view of the community benefits extra care can provide, should an affordable housing element be considered at all?
- Alternatively, should a reduction specific to extra care be considered or negotiated off site contributions.

Planning
- Could a specific policy for extra care be adopted in the Core Strategy?
- Look at the potential of site allocation in the LDF to ensure delivery. This has potential for major sites but is less practical for smaller sites.
- Clarity on the interpretation of planning use (C2/C3) would benefit development as would the opportunity of pre planning meetings to development indicative costs at an early stage.

- Split contracts for housing management and care and support provision will inhibit providers.
- Some private sector charges comparable with public sector.
- Extra care can offer the following benefits:
  - Benefits the wider community
  - Employment benefits
  - Links with local schools improve intergenerational relationships.
  - Potential to release family homes.

Conclusions

1. Clear guidance in terms of potential exemption from an affordable housing contribution would help stimulate interest in development.
2. Regular events to promote partnership with the private sector should be encouraged and the development of a list of providers to access advice on current development ideas.
3. Private sector can deliver high quality accommodation to offer wider choice to largely home owning population in South Gloucestershire.

What sort of additional information, if any, would organisations need regarding the market?

Private sector has good research to inform their business viability.
Evidence does show that people choose homes near to where they already live and have built social networks.
Good standard of information available on the South Gloucestershire website.
Information needs to improve to market less attractive areas
Wider release of any LA land portfolio.
LA should not only be concerned with capital receipt but should consider community benefits as well.
Single conversation will facilitate a less piecemeal approach to future development and also mean extra care will be identified in supported housing strategy more effectively.
Need to improve long term evidence of demand for extra care, this will develop as schemes come on stream. Care and support needs are hidden in the wider community and it is this group who need to be made aware of the services extra care can offer.
Need to promote options with partnership working between council, RSLs and developers when considering the delivery of care and support.

Conclusion

1. Improve publicity.
2. Promote opportunities for wider partnership working with the private sector.
3. Ensure promotion of benefits of the development of extra care in less attractive areas.
4. Promote the potential of equity release and reverse stair casing in leasehold sales to fund care and support services.

Models of extra care housing would organisations consider?

- Extra care should be marketed as a care and support needs based product rather than just a housing product.
- Location very important.
- Rural sites/areas are poorly served. More emphasis should be given to consider what extra care could bring to local services and facilities. Should be environmentally neutral but provide economic and social stimulus.
- Larger flats will have to be considered as future aspirations change, one bed flats are likely to become obsolete.
- Developers have to consider future proofing and consider schemes as Intergenerational products.
- New designs should be considered as an example the provision of nursing homes with extra care.
- Does the term extra care convey the wrong impression?
- More flexibility with nominations to affordable accommodation and a less structured view of “balanced communities”.

Conclusion

1. Design guidelines should have scope for flexibility and be the basis of new ideas.
2. A move away from classic models of extra care will be necessary to “future proof” schemes for the future.
3. Vital to maintain high design and service delivery standards in an unstable economic climate.
4. Successful marketing and location to promote leasehold.
Appendix 11 - Environment Partnership Strategic Green Infrastructure (GI) Event, 18th January 2010

This report summarises the outcomes from event held on 18th January 2010 at Turnberrie’s Community Centre, Thornbury to consider Green Infrastructure in South Gloucestershire. The event was hosted by the Environment Partnership, which is one of five strategic partnerships that reports to and advises the South Gloucestershire Local Strategic Partnership.

The purpose of the event was to
- To communicate what is meant by green infrastructure and what the benefits are.
- To provide information on the emerging policy position on strategic green infrastructure in the Core Strategy and to provide the opportunity for discussing and commenting on the policy proposals relating to GI Objectives and those attending were invited to submit comments on the draft Open Space Standards Policy.
- To provide information on existing strategic green infrastructure assets and projects
- To provide the opportunity to start to identify green infrastructure opportunities, why they are important and how they can be delivered

A report summarising the event has been attached below to display the comments received following the event on the draft Open Spaces Standards Core Strategy Policy as this was not subject to discussion at the event.
Welcome and Introductions

Steve Grainger, Chair of the Environment Partnership, welcomed everyone to the meeting, introduced the agenda for the consultation event - ‘Strategic Green Infrastructure’ and explained that the event would consist of a number of presentations and workshops:

The first presentation would be given by Andrew Lane, Spatial Planning Officer at South Gloucestershire Council who will provide a background to what green infrastructure is and its importance in South Gloucestershire’s future.

The second presentation would be given by Amanda Grundy of Natural England; this presentation will provide the national, regional, and sub-regional context for Green Infrastructure planning and provide an example of a strategic green infrastructure project.

Andrew Lane will then provide the context for the group workshops, and the remaining time will be used for working through the pre-event material. Groups will look at the existing strategic GI network, review project opportunities and consider the Council’s emerging GI Objectives policies for inclusion in the Council’s Core Strategy, part of the Local Development Framework.

Introduction to Strategic Green Infrastructure (GI) Presentation

A presentation was given by Andrew Lane from South Gloucestershire Council’s Spatial Planning Team. Andrew provided some background information on the concept of Green Infrastructure and explained that the Council is preparing a Green Infrastructure Strategy.

The Council have developed the following definition of what Green Infrastructure is:

Green Infrastructure (GI) consists of a multi-functional network of high quality green space and linkages which operate at a variety of spatial scales. GI assets contribute to people’s well-being, and together comprise a coherent managed resource responsive to evolving conditions.

Andrew explained that the Council have reviewed the commonalities in the various definitions of Green Infrastructure, these include:

- GI is critical in delivering sustainable communities and addressing the challenges of climate change.
- GI is based on the concept of a network.
- GI is multi-functional and provides multi-functional (a range of) benefits.
The concept of GI takes account of urban and rural sites and connections – including the links between.
There is a desire to ensure high quality.
GI can be considered as a mechanism or concept for drawing together partners and delivering greater benefits.

Andrew explained that the concept of Green Infrastructure can be considered at all scales, from local, to district to sub-regional level of assets and the associated activities relating to them. The focus of the workshop was to consider the strategic assets and activities that are relevant to the sub-region and across the district.

The concept of Green Infrastructure brings multiple environmental, social and economic benefits, crucial for the delivery of sustainable communities. It should be planned using a proactive, whole area approach.

Andrew concluded his presentation highlighting the importance of partnership working in delivering the maximum benefits. With tighter budget constraints being faced by partners it is now even more important to work smarter.

Introduction to Strategic GI Opportunities & Sub-Regional Working Presentation

This presentation was provided by Amanda Grundy, vice-chair of the South Gloucestershire Environmental Partnership and Natural England employee. Amanda set out the national and regional definitions of Green Infrastructure, and noted how these were reflected in South Gloucestershire’s definition.

Amanda provided an update on the sub-regional (West of England) GI planning that is taking place across the four Unitary Authorities, and highlighted the existing West of England GI projects, which include:

- WoE GI Tool Kit
- WoE Local Sites Register
- Avon Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP)

The DEFRA agencies have also established a West of England GI Advisory Group, this is a focused forum for collaborative approaches to taking forward Green (& Blue) Infrastructure. Natural England have set up a project to identify and prioritise joint thematic and/or site based projects across the sub-region. Amanda highlighted that the information recorded at today’s event would be fed into this project.

Amanda provided details of the Severnside / Avonmouth Habitat Creation Project, as a local example of how joint GI working was being taken forward. The project is focused on the Severnside / Avonmouth area, which is an area of significant existing economic activity with additional economic development potential, alongside international, national and locally designated habitats. A joint study has been started with funding from Bristol City Council, South Gloucestershire Council and Natural England to identify existing and potential new wetland habitat for European protected waterfowl. In order to deliver multiple benefits this new network of inter-connected nature reserves would be accessible to people and designated as Local Nature Reserves (LNR). The sites will offer people opportunities to study and enjoy nature, whilst being of significant benefit to the biodiversity value of the area.
Workshops

Andrew Lane provided details of the information and mapping that had been provided on everyone's table (and circulated in advance of the event). The material was structured in relation to four principal functions of GI (Biodiversity, Climate Change, Recreation, play and access, and Landscape and Heritage). The maps and supporting information set out Strategic GI as follows:

- The main assets and linkages;
- The main associated activities; and
- Identified opportunities.

This information provided the basis for those attending to consider the following questions:

1. Have the main assets and linkages been identified?
2. Have the main associated activities been identified?
3. What are the gaps and where is the supporting data held?
4. What are your views on the identified opportunities?
5. What other opportunities would you like to see realised and how could they be achieved?

WORKSHOP RESPONSES:

During the workshops, participants were divided into seven facilitated tables who worked together to answer the questions. Each group's facilitator guided them through the material in order to answer the five questions. Below is a summary of the feedback recorded from all the groups:

1. Have the main assets and linkages been identified?
2. Have the main associated activities been identified?
3. What are the gaps and where is the supporting data held?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAPS</th>
<th>Data sources/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Woodlands** | Data available from Forestry Commission on grant aided woodland and from National Inventory (over 2 ha) (Rob Spence)  
Woodland Trust data  
Community Forest Plan includes woodland with public access |
| **Hedgerows** | Data available from hedgerow survey and local surveys for development areas (BRERC) |
| **Higher Level Stewardship** | Natural England |

Assets, Linkages and Activities

- Woodlands: Woodlands are important for climate change and recreation as well as biodiversity. All woodland should be shown on the maps not just ancient woodland.
- Accessible woodland
- Hedgerows: Should be highlighted as strategic assets even if they can't be mapped at this level
- Higher Level Stewardship: Agricultural stewardship schemes
| **Farmland Bird Biodiversity Scheme**  
Operates in the AONB, Natural England project | AONB / Natural England |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field boundary project survey data</strong></td>
<td>BRERC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority Habitats</strong></td>
<td>BAP / BRERC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sites of Nature Conservation Importance</strong></td>
<td>BRERC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cotswold AONB: Grassland Project</strong></td>
<td>AONB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Pasture Land, Open Access Land and Commons**  
Often have high biodiversity and landscape value | Natural England Stewardship Scheme  
Magic.gov.uk (Check with Chris Hogg) |
| **Blue Infrastructure**  
Rivers (including the River Avon), river corridors, water courses and rhines. Highlight areas of significant blue infrastructure in addition to rivers and floodplains, such as the lake at Stoke Park and the Kennet and Avon Canal. | Environmental Agency / SGC |
| **Orchards**  
New project to regenerate and start new orchards – could be shown | John Morris SGC |
| **Tranquillity**  
Tranquillity mapping has been undertaken by CPRE | CPRE (Hilary Severn) |
| **Tytherington ridge/hillside**  
Visually important | SGC |
| **Railway Lines and Motorways**  
Indicate the main transport routes as they often have valuable habitats and/or walking routes alongside them |  |
| **Local Public Access Routes**  
Show all PROW and bridleways. Show all promoted and linear routes. Local routes within walking and cycling distance of towns / villages | PROW Team / JLA |
|  | Information needs to be developed and promoted locally Chris Hogg Joint Access Forum |
| **Strategic and Local Commuting Routes**  
Bristol to Bath Cycle Path  
New Cycle routes from cycle city network  
Network of local routes are important to | Cycle City Info  
Sustrans?  
Transport Policy Team, SGC? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old lanes and byways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historical Features / Industrial and Archaeological sites</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Roads, Warmley Gardens &amp; Grotto, Barrs Court, battlefields, Bitton Railway, Willsbridge Mill and the SAM at Hall End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGC, Natural and Built Environment Team, SHEP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation Facilities &amp; Other Attractions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicate larger recreational sites, such as the Stub Ridings, Pompfrey Hill, Mundy Playing Fields, and key destinations such as the Eco-Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGC, Spatial Planning and SHEP Teams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renewable Energy Opportunity Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When the results of the renewable energy study are known, display the results eg opportunity areas for potential wind farms. Identify opportunities for small scale hydro electricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGC Renewable Energy Study, Dan Jones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement Names and Urban Area Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Could display the larger urban assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGC, Andrew Lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motorways and main roads can split up corridors and prevent access on foot or by bike to the surrounding countryside, eg no access to Winterbourne from Bradley Stoke except through a drainage tunnel under the road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map showing obstacles may help prioritise improvements that are needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross boundary linkages and assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The maps should be extended beyond the LA boundaries to show the adjoining assets and linkages and to check for synergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring local authorities Joint Access Forum for PROW network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What are your views on the identified opportunities?
The majority of comments were supportive of the identified opportunities, and identified a need for more information in order to take them forward.
5. What other opportunities would you like to see realised and how could they be achieved?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION (what &amp; why)</th>
<th>WHO? (lead &amp; partners)</th>
<th>HOW? (delivery &amp; funding)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreation and Access</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear routes from the urban areas out into the countryside</td>
<td>SGC, Developers</td>
<td>Development and improvement of local paths to access them, Master planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritise improvements in accessibility from densely populated areas to strategic paths / assets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible Circular Walks</strong></td>
<td>SGC, Parish Councils, Developers/land owners, Ramblers Association</td>
<td>Implemented through development plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifunctional benefits, access and health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improved signage on cycle and walking routes</strong></td>
<td>SUSTRANS, SGC, Developer, Parish &amp; Town Councils, Walk England</td>
<td>Developer Contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route signage should provide details of where the path goes, distance etc, and interpretation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prioritising new GI within 2 miles of existing and potential development</strong></td>
<td>Joint Local Access Forum, SGC, Developer</td>
<td>Include in master planning for new urban extensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing and promoting access to it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promote access through the use of technology</strong></td>
<td>SGC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate the potential to use GPS technology to create interactive routes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure there is public access to datasets via web/GIS to promote use of GI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mapping of points of interest, heritage and environmental assets</strong></td>
<td>SGC, Parish and Town Councils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping of key points of interest on local routes, and promoting these within the relevant locality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education:</strong></td>
<td>SGC, Developers, Schools, PROW, DFRA, SGC</td>
<td>Developer contributions, Leaflets to be prepared, There are links with health, Info boards, leaflets and technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling and Walking (and other GI) information for residents/employees of new and existing developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better promotion to raise awareness of existing assets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure information is clear and simple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rights of Way</strong></td>
<td>SGC</td>
<td>Through development proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect them and remove blockages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffer rights of way to deliver multiple benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where towns / villages now have by-passes or new sections of road, there may be opportunities to close sections of the original roads to traffic and develop ‘green lanes’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extend opportunities for informal use of natural areas / the countryside where appropriate</strong></td>
<td>Responsibilities need to be identified</td>
<td>Mechanisms to be identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Create Green bridges over roads and motorways to provide links for people and wildlife</strong></td>
<td>Highways Agency</td>
<td><strong>Role of JLTP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promote recreational use of blue infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>British Waterways Kennet and Avon Trust</td>
<td>Waterway corridor policy Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Bridleway Network</strong></td>
<td>ROWIP British Horse Society</td>
<td>Identification of a strategic bridleway route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ensure new developments have large amenity areas.</strong></td>
<td>SGC Developers Parish Councils</td>
<td>Develop policies that will deliver large amenity area as part of new development, as well as prioritise improvements in availability of public open space in areas with an existing deficit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improve availability of public open space where there are deficits.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promote open air physical activity for health benefits through landscape, heritage, and access</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessing more people with info about outdoor opportunities. Increase cycle hire. Improved info &amp; interpretation (including using new technologies).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biodiversity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengthen Protection for Hedgerows</strong> 5 – 30 metre wide buffer should be protected along hedgerows to create sustainable habitat corridors. In development areas, 30m wide buffers along hedgerows should be protected from development. They should be maintained in public ownership.</td>
<td>SGC Developers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Biodiversity Zones</strong> Develop the concept to complement the Strategic Nature Areas (SNAs), to reflect the significant local biodiversity assets in South Gloucestershire. Importance of local sites to build up strategic network and provide network connections</td>
<td>BAP SGC SG Biodiversity Partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manage Roadside verges for Biodiversity and hedgerow protection</strong></td>
<td>SGC Highways Agency Hawk and Owl Trust Local Volunteers AONB</td>
<td>Changes to management practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commons management</strong> Enhance biodiversity and access through improved management</td>
<td>SGC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creation of Local Nature Reserves (LNRs)</strong> Identify resources for the creation of LNRs proactively, not just off the back of development</td>
<td>SGC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motorways, railways and other highway corridors</strong> Improve management for biodiversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIGS – promote geological assets</strong> Example of similar project: Cotswold GeoPark</td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.cotswoldhillsg">http://www.cotswoldhillsg</a> eopark.net/](<a href="http://www.cotswoldhillsg">http://www.cotswoldhillsg</a> eopark.net/)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase tree planting in urban areas</strong></td>
<td>SGC Developers Forest of Avon Trust Street Trees Garden Forest/Orchard Project Protect semi-mature trees Standards for new developments Master Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Water attenuation and management</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide a guide that highlights best practice – providing for sustainable water management whilst maximising biodiversity benefits.</td>
<td>SGC Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Shoreline Management – Flood Risk</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building on stilts in areas prone to flooding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Consider climate change at the householder level</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure space for cycle storage, recycling and logical walking links to surrounding areas</td>
<td>SGC – planning policies / Development management Developers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Landscape and Heritage</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historical Interpretation of GI</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify the history of existing GI - man’s impact on the environment over time. Interpretation should be provided - not just focusing on the ‘important’ heritage features, but providing insights to strengthen the value of local GI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>River Landscape Project</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Other GI Themed Opportunities</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Food Production / Security:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of allotments Community Supported Agriculture Schemes Need to map what food we currently produce Protect soil integrity /Grade 1 and 2 land Maximise opportunities, especially at the urban edge/towns</td>
<td>CRPE Beekeepers Associations Soil Association SG Local Food Partnership Cllr Hope Council to set aside more land for food production. Encourage farmers to grow more fruit and vegetables locally (though difficult to influence farmers to do this if it is not the most profitable option). Education Training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Review Community Forest Plan</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan identified many opportunities – needs to be reviewed and prioritised</td>
<td>Forest of Avon Trust SGC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Increase woodland coverage</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide new woodlands outside but accessible from new developments. Consider species and locations</td>
<td>Forestry Commission (lead) Forest of Avon Trust SGC Developers Grants to landowners from Forestry Commission Developer contributions Management Trusts Access Agreements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Places</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Bristol Environ</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overscourt Wood, Warmley Forest Park and</td>
<td>SGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Siston Common.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Capture the strategic functions and importance of this area and move away from individual assets. Strengthen the assets and linkages between them</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Country Park for East Bristol** | **Developed from network of existing assets – Warmley Forest Park, Overscourt Woodland, Siston Common, Siston Conservation Area, with links to Willsbridge Mill, the Bristol and Bath Railway Path etc with safe linkages between – could extend out to Dyrham Park, the Cotswolds AONB with links through Wick Golden Valley**  
**Would create a network of multifunctional assets for enjoyment by all.** |
| **Forestry Commission** | **SGC**  
**Joint Local Access Forum**  
**Wildlife Trust**  
**Natural England**  
**Private landowners**  
**National Trust**  
**Forest of Avon Trust**  
**Requires a project group to develop a vision, plan and funding strategy** |
| **Country Park beside the M32** | **SGC**  
**Bristol City Council** |
| **Strategic opportunities to strengthen the GI network - developing existing assets and improving linkages** | **Bristol East Fringe.**  
**Thornbury, Littleton-Upon-Severn, and Alveston.**  
**Severnside.**  
**M32 corridor**  
**North of Yate connecting with Wickwar and Lower Woods.**  
**Limestone ridgeline, north Chipping Sodbury**  
**Important corridor: heritage, landscape, recreation, biodiversity.**  
**Avon and Frome Valleys** |
| **SGC** | **Private landowners**  
**Developers**  
**Wildlife Trust**  
**Others**  
**Avon and Frome Partnership** |
| **Improve cycle network between Yate and Bradley Stoke** | **SGC**  
**Cycle City Project**  
**Developer contributions** |
| **Filton Airfield land** | **Strategic corridor linking SGC and BCC, especially the railway corridor** |
| **BCC** | **SGC**  
**Through the West of England GI Group.** |
| **Land Management** | **Land Maintenance & Management Policy**  
**Land should be managed to maximise GI benefits**  
**Minimise use of pesticides. Where use of pesticides cannot be avoided, use species-specific pesticides.** |
| **SGC** | **Developers**  
**Long term management and maintenance options to be detailed within the GI Strategy.** |
| **Increase community use of assets** | **Initiatives to increase use of school grounds** |
| **Schools – empower them and youth groups to use them more eg at weekends** | **Change the role of governors – give a duty to open up more. Parents involved with children to lessen the fear** |
factor and encourage greater use of existing green spaces.

**Processes for the Identification of GI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Obstacles and problems – to identify opportunities to resolve them</th>
<th>SGC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Audit of land and the best use for GI**
Which areas are suitable to deliver different climate change benefits (eg food, shading, water storage, habitat connectivity, biomass, wind development etc). This could provide a wish-list for different areas. Ideally should include both public and private land.

| Need clear objectives / consistent and comparable methodology |
| To make more manageable could focus of growth areas and/or large areas in a single ownership first. |

| Land owner map to identify key landowners to work with and coordinate effort | B&NES are considering this. |

Although the focus of the consultation event was on strategic GI opportunities, ideas recorded at the event represent a broad range of potential opportunities across all spatial scales. A general point was made and reflected in the opportunities that local and strategic GI assets should complement one another, and that all the small scale local assets together are strategically important.

**Feedback from the workshops**

Each table’s facilitator was asked to feed back a single priority or main point from the workshops:

- Whilst strategic assets such as walking routes are important, local assets that are well signed from the urban areas are very important too, as are the non-strategic links that provide the connections between people and assets and reduce the need to travel by car to access the assets.
- Highlight accessibility and information as a strategic priority to make better use of existing GI. Use technology to increase use, such as iphone applications, digital photo trails etc.
- A New Country Park on the East Fringe of Bristol’s urban edge
- Better use of school grounds and ensure GI is used by schools
- Importance of local food production opportunities particularly on the urban edge.
- Target urban fringe area. Ensure appropriate management processes for GI are in place, where possible involving local people.
- Broaden the use of existing assets to ensure they are multi-functional.

**Core Strategy Presentation**

Andrew Lane set out details of the Council’s draft Core Strategy policies on Green Infrastructure Objectives and the open space standards. Andrew explained that the focus of the workshop discussion would be the Green Infrastructure Objectives policy and that comments regarding the open space standards policy could be submitted via email to the Council’s Spatial Planning Team.
Core Strategy Workshop

The seven groups considered the following questions:

- Does the policy cover your expectations and knowledge of Green Infrastructure, and its potential benefits?
- Does the policy provide an appropriate framework for delivering strategic Green Infrastructure?
- Do the four strategic functions encapsulate your aspirations for Green Infrastructure in South Gloucestershire?
- Do you have any other comments?

The following draft Green Infrastructure Policy was presented:

Policy: Green Infrastructure Objectives

The Council and its partners will ensure that existing and new Green Infrastructure (GI) is planned as an integral part of creating sustainable communities, considering the following GI objectives:

a. Potential for mitigating and adapting to climate change.

b. Delivering multi-functional and connected open spaces (including water).

c. Protecting and enhancing the linkages between GI assets within urban areas and the wider countryside.

d. Improving recreational, play and local food cultivation opportunities.

e. Protecting species and habitats and create new habitats and wildlife linkages, particularly where biodiversity conservation and enhancement is affected by development.

f. Conserving and enhancing landscape character, historical and cultural heritage features.

g. Securing ongoing management and maintenance.

h. Joint working with partners, including neighbouring local authorities.

The above objectives should be considered in development proposals and Local Development Documents under the following four strategic principal functions:

- Biodiversity
- Climate Change – Adaptation and Mitigation
- Recreation, Play and Access
- Landscape and Heritage

The Strategic Green Infrastructure Network:

The integrity, multi-functionality, quality and connectivity of the Strategic Green Infrastructure Network, will be protected and enhanced. Opportunities to connect with and extend the strategic network will be taken.

Further guidance on how the policy will be implemented will be contained in a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
can overlap and interrelate with other GI elements. The supporting diagram displays the network, it is intended as a guide and is illustrative and it is not intended that the diagram designates sites. The diagram provides a broad indication of the strategic green infrastructure assets which are important at a sub-regional and district scale and therefore can be used to guide decision making that would impact on these important assets.

WORKSHOP RESPONSES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments recorded during the event regarding the draft policy:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the policy apply to existing communities? Clarification is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The phrase “quality of life” should be included as this is the purpose of the policy and sums up what is trying to be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Natural play needs to be included and provided for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The objectives need to comply with CPREs Vision to 2026, and the objectives it contains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Important to be able get to and from existing urban areas. Existing access routes need to be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Clarify what is meant by on-going management and maintenance in supporting justification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Does the policy strive to improve standards for GI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Clarity is needed on the statement relating to local food cultivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What provision is made to protect the best farming land?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Should food security be an identified issue?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Does the policy apply to existing and proposed GI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. What provision will be made for delivery?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. GI assets should be considered not just for their recreational value, but as access routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The GI policy should be central to the Core Strategy/Local Development Framework and resulting development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Blue infrastructure should also be covered more clearly by the policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Suggested wording change: The Council and its partners will ensure that existing and new Green Infrastructure (GI) is planned, delivered and managed as an integral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
part of creating sustainable communities.

17. What happens if an application is received on an identified area of GI?

18. Is there potential to reuse filled land as GI?

19. Point F need to identify the Councils aspirations

20. Point G very important as it picks up on the commuted sum.

21. The policy needs to recognise the threat to encroachment on GI from development

22. The policy needs to be stronger on defending existing assets – protection for what we have now (at every spatial scale). (But we need to have robust information about what it is we are protecting and why).

23. The delivery plan for the Policy should be integral, otherwise the Policy can’t be delivered. Needs partners to sign up to specific activities. Where off-site contributions are sought from developers for GI, we need to have identified GI development priorities

24. Public ownership and management is key. The Council needs to adopt existing assets requiring protection / management within growth areas (though context of limited resources for management).

25. Health promotion benefits are missing from the GI objectives

26. Split objective D into 2 - recreation / play / social space, and local food cultivation.

27. Policy needs to reflect importance of informal recreation. Add ‘social space’ wording to policy, to reflect role of GI in community interaction/ places where people can come together (without necessarily being involved in ‘recreation and play’).

28. Importance of good quality design, eg success of amenity GI depends on how the development is laid out around it (don’t always put the most expensive houses next to the park).

29. Policy and delivery plan needs to allow for greening the existing urban areas, and not just the growth areas.

30. Rights of Way should be specifically mentioned.

31. What will happen below the strategic level to ensure delivery of the GI network?

32. Food and water need to have separate headings in order to show the priority for these basic necessities. Both these need protecting and improvement of supply and access.

33. Improve recreation and play (point D)

34. Make note of access as well as accessibility.

37. Criteria C – protects linkages but not actual assets, is this picked up by another policy in the Core Strategy? Or is it an oversight?
| 38. | Criteria G – need explanation of what is meant by this criterion and how it will be achieved |
| 39. | Conceptual diagram must ‘scream’ potential links and opportunities (as referred to in the text below the policy) as visual representation of what is trying to be achieved |
| 40. | Criteria e and b(?) add words ‘between them’ – delete all words from “particularly…” as a principle in itself, not just where biodiversity is impacted. |
| 41. | In supporting explanation – explain that blue infrastructure is included in the definition of GI. |
| 42. | Criterion e – delete words “within urban area…” |

**Additional Comments received following the event:**

A. It might be useful to have two separate policies, one dealing with exiting GI and the other dealing with new GI.

B. Issue facing the authority is whether existing GI should be safeguarded or protected.

C. A key question is about delivery.

D. The policy references on-going management and maintenance, this should be clarified, does it refer to existing or new GI?

E. Will contributions be sought from CIL or S106?

F. The policy refers to the Strategic GI network, these features should be shown on the proposals map. Plan users need to understand what GI is being protected by the Council.

G. Any GI enhancements needs to be clearly identified, particularly those of strategic nature, not linked to specific development.

Andrew confirmed that the comments received would be considered and used to inform the policy development for the Core Strategy and the Green Infrastructure Strategy.

**Conclusion and Next Steps**

Steve Grainger thanked everyone for coming and contributing to this Environment Partnership Event.

The Green Infrastructure Strategy will be developed as a result of the information recorded at the event. Additional information will be collected where appropriate to set out the necessary detail to explain the future opportunities. This information will be considered by the appropriate Council departments, co-ordinated by the officers.
Green Spaces Working Group, and incorporated where appropriate into the Green Infrastructure Strategy.

The comments received on the draft policies will be considered, and the revised policies are planned to be presented to the Council’s Cabinet on the 8th March 2010, as part of the next stage of the Core Strategy.
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COMMENTS RECEIVED RELATING TO THE DRAFT OPEN SPACES STANDARDS CORE STRATEGY POLICY

All the attendees were provided with a copy of the draft Open Space Standards Core Strategy policy set out below and were asked to respond to the following questions via email:

- Does the policy reflect the range of types of open space that communities use?
- Do you have any comments regarding the draft standards?
- Do you have any other comments?

Draft Open Space Standards Policy presented:

Policy: Open Space Standards

Where existing useable Green Infrastructure provisions, including open space, outdoor sports facilities, playspace, allotments, and natural spaces are inadequate in terms of quantity, quality and accessibility to meet the projected needs arising from the future occupiers of new developments, those occupiers needs must be met by the new development, together with provision for its subsequent maintenance.

Green Infrastructure assets are integral to sustainable communities. Green Infrastructure provision will be sought according to the following principles:
1. New developments must comply with all the Council’s Green Infrastructure standards of provision in terms of quantity, quality (usability) and accessibility.
2. Provision must be delivered on-site unless off-site provision or enhancement would be more acceptable to the Local Planning Authority.

New developments may also be required to contribute to Green Infrastructure schemes identified in the Green Infrastructure Strategy.

New open spaces should be an integral part of new employment areas, and should meet local objectives to be agreed as part of the planning application process. These spaces should adhere to the Green Infrastructure Objectives and be managed to allow open access to both local workers and residents unless it can be demonstrated that there is an overriding security issue such that access to local residents should be restricted.

Environments for play are required to be considered as an integral part of site design, including both public and semi-private communal open space areas.
**Quantity Standards resulting from Residential Developments [DRAFT]:**
The following standards are presented as DRAFT; they are based on the PPG17 audit which is currently being updated following the site verification work undertaken with our Town and Parish Councils.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of accessible Open Space</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Requirement - Minimum figures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal recreational open space</td>
<td>Including parks, amenity green space and green corridors – these areas provide for informal recreation, play and access.</td>
<td>1.9 ha/1000 population (Provision to be made in accordance with the Council’s Play Policy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and Semi-Natural urban green space</td>
<td>Areas of green space where the primary purpose is one of wildlife and biodiversity conservation and value.</td>
<td>1ha/1000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports facilities</td>
<td>Includes all outdoor sports facilities whether naturally or artificially surfaced, e.g. playing pitches, bowling greens and tennis courts. Including full sized Multi Use Games Areas (MUGAs).</td>
<td>1.6ha/1000 population, of which 1.2ha is for playing pitches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for Children and Young People</td>
<td>All equipped children’s play areas.</td>
<td>0.25ha/1000 population equipped playspace. (Provision to be made in accordance with the Council’s Play Policy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>An area of allotment plots and associated infrastructure used for the purpose of producing, fruit, vegetables or flowers for personal use.</td>
<td>0.2ha/1000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.95ha/1000 population total.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private/Semi-Private outdoor space</td>
<td>Space used for informal recreation and/or clothes drying, including: Private gardens; Communal gardens; and Balcones</td>
<td>Adequate provision to meet the needs of the future occupiers, commensurate with design considerations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**RESPONSES**

### Comments recorded during the event regarding the draft policy:

1. Developers need to be clear about what they are required to provide, a method of calculation should be available. Maintenance needs to be clear and reasonable, with the greater amount of space to be provided in line with the proposals in the core strategy providing a commuted sum for this amount of space could render many schemes unviable. Core Strategy should allow for both commuted sums and management schemes providing such schemes operate to the council’s standards? Aztec West good example, Milton Keynes maintenance trust.

2. Management plan / community ownership can install a sense of pride and responsibility into a community which can result is very well managed, used and respected open spaces. Needs buy in not always possible in urban areas.

### Additional Comments received following the event:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Do the standards reflect local perspectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Do the standards take account of private land?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>The requirement for commuted sums for maintenance must remain realistic, proportionate and reasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>The option for delivery of off-site GI in lieu of on-site should be open to developer as well as the local planning authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Open space standards for sheltered housing and nursing homes should specially reflect the characteristics of future residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>From an initial assessment of the standards, they seem unreasonable. More detail is needed on the background to the standards. Further consultation should be undertaken with developers, landowners and agents before the standards are included in the draft core strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>It is unclear whether the standards will apply to all development or whether any size thresholds will be set?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>The policy appears to be seeking to rectify existing known shortfalls by penalising proposed new development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 12: Open space, sport and recreation consultation event, February 2010

This report presents the comments recorded at the workshop event held on the 10th February 2010, it took place at Thornbury Leisure Centre, to consider open spaces, sport and recreation facilities. Invitations for this evening workshop was sent to South Gloucestershire Councillors, all town and parish councils, secondary school head teachers, local friends groups, environmental, local safer stronger groups, hub clubs, leisure providers and sports associations.

A complete consultation report, which will incorporate details of this workshop is being prepared this will set out the responses to the householder survey and other consultation undertaken in 2009/10, to support the future planning of provision for open space, sport, recreation and play facilities.

The workshop evening provided people with an opportunity to express their views on the quantity, quality and accessibility of open space, sport and recreation facilities in their area. The district was split into five areas, with a table focusing on the north fringe of the Bristol urban area, the east fringe of the Bristol urban area, Yate/Chipping Sodbury, Thornbury and elsewhere/rural areas, people were asked to sit at table that focused upon their area.

The aim of the workshop was to provide people with an opportunity to feed into the evidence base to support future open space, sport and recreation provision planning. It also provided an opportunity to identify specific concerns and issues about provision now and in the future. The results of the event will be used in the Green Infrastructure Strategy, Playing Pitch Strategy, Built Facilities Strategy, and future open space delivery plans. In total around 70 people from across the district and relevant council officers attended the event, details of attendance are at the end of this report.

The workshop event was introduced by Steve Evans, Director of Community Services at South Gloucestershire Council. He welcomed participants, set out the context for the evening, explained the challenges of growth and ensuring facilities are in place to supporting sustainable and healthy communities, he then introduced the team that were providing short introductory presentations, handing over to Andrew Lane. Andrew, Spatial Planning Officer at South Gloucestershire Council set out the Planning Policy requirements for a comprehensive evidence base and provided feedback on the successful Green Infrastructure Event held in January 2010. Andrew handed over to Kim Hazeldine, head of sports and development at South Gloucestershire Council. Kim explained the Council was developing an Active Plan and working with Sport England to progress a built facilities strategy and a playing pitch strategy. Kim introduced to Len Croney. Len explained that he is a consultant working on behalf of Sport England in advising how the Council can take forward a facilities strategy. Len handed over the David Morrison, Community Spaces Manager at South Gloucestershire Council. David provided the practical context and issues of delivering open spaces, sport and recreation facilities, and explained the desire to survey and record quantity, quality and accessibility of sites and facilities.

Delegates on each table, representing the geographical area, were then guided by facilitators through the following questions:
Now
- What elements of current provision do people like / feel is good?
- What aspects do people value about the current provision? What is most important to them?
- Problems and issues with current provision
- Is current provision enough, of a good quality and accessible?

Future
- Growing population and development, what are the pressures, what will the impact be on open spaces and facilities?
- What facilities do we need for the future?
- What plans are already in place for new or improved facilities?
- How can we provide more joint facilities and work together to achieve and fund this?

The feedback from each of the areas represented at the workshop is summarised below.

**Table 1: Kingswood and East Fringe**

Mary Lewis, April Begley, Pat Casey, Mike Openshaw, Maureen? G Smith? Valerie Lee, Colin Hunt, James Hunt, Anne? Heather Goddard, John Goddard, One more gentleman?

**Now**

1. **What are the key/most important open spaces and facilities in the area? – Why?**

   Pomphey Hill, Cleeve Rugby and Mangotsfield football, Leap Valley, Skate Parks for youth activity e.g. Emembers Green Park, Commons for recreation e.g. Rodway, Siston, Hanham and Lyde Green, Leisure Centres for community engagement and sport, Bridle Paths and Walkways, Village Halls for community engagement, Frome Valley, Leap valley.

   Open Space, Horse trails and dog walking, Avon valley trail, woods for conservation, Warmley Forest Park, Railway Path.

   Cock Road Ridge – Natural open space, acts as a buffer, good for walkers and dog walkers, opportunity to socialise, wildlife and informal recreation.

   Grimsbury Farm – Education, wildlife and plant life.

   Greenbank Park, football, cricket and dog walking, play area for children, pavilion.

   Allotments for Leisure and ecology

   Lincombe Barn – Wildlife open space and children’s play area, Magpie Bottom, King George V Playing fields, Bromley Heath Park – good for all ages, Footpaths give access to the countryside.

   Warmley Signal Box – Historic Site

   Hanham Mount - Heritage, Habitat

2. **What do people feel we are short of?**

   Facilities for older and younger children, activities with no cost, Bowling greens, indoor facilities, and picnic areas, Skateboarding facilities, ease of access.
More for walkers, access to sports grounds, Bridle routes, areas for unsupervised youth activity, allotments, and five a side pitches, bus projects, usage of sites, protection of open space. 
Play areas, transport, and maintenance.

3. What elements of current provision do people like/feel is good?
Warmley community centre is well used and maintained, green areas for walking and dog walking, access to commons, safe natural open spaces for walking and a variety of habitat, Allotments, Pompfrey Hill and Leap Valley. 
Skate/BMX Parks, Grimsbury farm for young people, youth centres, litter free open space, great views, bridle ways and good maintenance.

4. What aspects to people value about the current provision
Informal spaces e.g. cock road ridge, Value e.g. woodlands/wildlife etc are free, Bridleways and open spaces, Skate Parks - kids, Walks, cycle paths, leisure centres and village halls – parents and local businesses.
Page Park – open space in an urban area and very well used, Gyms/swimming pools are valued, and Emersons Green Park is valued by older residents.

5. What is most important to them? As a group decide on the top 3
- Community/Leisure Centres (Multi-functional)
- Open Space for recreation
- Facilities for young children
- Allotments

6. Problems and issues with current provision
Abuse of commons and vandalism of skateboard parks and general areas, not enough informal open space, streams, not enough people involved in the community, consultations – not well organised, need more allotments, need more for teenagers, better maintenance needed, ASB due to lack of facilities, lack of funding, lack of resources, bridleways end on roads, areas are not joined up enough, lack of communication, need protection of cycle paths, fly tipping, more police patrol needed, better lighting needed, problems with horse riding.

7. Is current provision enough of a good quality and accessible? Cost, transport, distance from people, maintenance, feeling of safety etc
Poor maintenance, not enough facilities for the elderly or youths, not enough sport areas, nowhere for children to play safely and unsupervised. 
More comprehensive and larger leisure centres/sports centres needed. 
Play facilities should be improved however walks are improving.
There is quite a lot of bridleway provision however accessibility is poor, maintenance is mainly good. Bridleways are also multi-use e.g. walking, cycling. There is no provision for carriage drivers.
Current provision is not good enough for young people.
Future

1. Growing population and development, what are the pressures, what will the impact be on open spaces and facilities?
   - Within each new development there should be a focal point for each community.
   - There will be the pressure of having a larger amount of young people
   - We will need more multi use facilities
   - Developments may not get designed properly
   - Community entitlements
   - There will need to be more communication and areas need to be joined up.

2. What facilities do we need for the future?
   - More facilities for the elderly e.g. walking/bowls
   - Multi functional facilities that are adaptable for all ages
   - Orienteering, horse riding, wild walks etc
   - Cultural facilities such as an amphitheatre

3. What plans are already in place for new or improved facilities?
   - Car Parking – Lincombe Barn
   - Play Areas
   - Community green houses at Hanham Hall park

4. How can we provide more joint facilities and work together to achieve and fund this?
   - It needs to be sustainable
   - Possibly need an income generation e.g. a bar etc
   - Multiple sports/evening entertainment and education
   - Better maintenance or stand alone public facilities
   - Outside grant funding for community groups
   - Involve the young people

Table 2: North Fringe

NOW

Most Important

- Local Nature Reserve – 3 Brooks BSCL
- Playing Fields at Elm Park
- Northville Millennium Green
- Coniston Road Playing Field
- Patchway Common
- Winterbourne Recreational Field
- Hooper’s Farm – Riding Academy
- Bradley Brook LNR
• Huckford Quarry LNR

**Most Important**

• Better use of Existing Spaces
• Lack of Facilities and Space for young people
• Recreational use of Green Belt
• Current Facilities for Capacity

**What’s Missing**

**Winterbourne**
• Open Sports Facilities

**Patchway**
• Indoor sports facilities
• Not Enough facilities/ not enough capacity

• **Filton**
• Lack of facilities for basket ball
• Conygre Area- Lack of general facilities
• Wise campus may help resolve this

**Bradley Stoke**
• Playing Fields
• Lack of area to play ball games (Formal & informal areas)
• Children’s play areas

**What’s would ease Situation?**

**Patchway**
• Accessibility
• Good Accessibility to a sports centre

**Future**

• Current facilities at full capacity
• Teams at winterbourne
• Play page park and Patchway
• Patchway teams go to Pilning – lack of facilities in parish
• Cost is an Accessibility factor
• Use Limited by Quality and Availability of Ancillary Facilities – Changing Rooms, Childs protection and Standards of play
• Green Spaces will Deteriorate due to over use
• Ongoing lack of Availability of Allotments
• More land for woodland Planting
• Should Green Belt be used for other leisure purposes?

**What do we need for the future?**

• Children’s play areas
• Disabled children’s play areas
• Spaces for Teenagers – Social Spaces
• Facilities for ageing population to keep older population well and healthy
• Facilities for peoples mental well being
• Contact with nature and natural environment
• Safe places to exercise
• Footpaths would help protect Green Spaces
• Local facilities to help protect Green Spaces

Post its

• Name of person to send parish plans to and how to get them adopted. Deborah white. Send to all contacts tonight please.
• Pressures of Rural area
• Facilities for future
• Current plans
• Joint- Working Maintenance
• Bridleways need to be improved as circular routes and well maintained
• Parish Plans need to be taken on board by SGC and used as evidence (A lot of hard work)
• 3 Key Priorities
• Get group consensus in local areas to comment on planning request
• Identify to group of local reps from all sectors of 2 community to comment jointly on 2 planning requests – not in isolation
• All aspects of planning need to be considered as they impact directly on one another i.e affordable housing for local people rather than just bringing more people in
• No further build on existing provision
• Improved accessibility at local level to avoid local people having to drive to facilities
• Be very clear about ensuring there is build provision for local people
• All rural resources are under pressure as they are so attractive as easy access to countryside – Need to be valued
• Allotments and Community trusts
• Wildlife areas in allotments
• Parishes to be able to acquire land to provide extra, Facilities
• Sports provision and associated buildings
• Improve investment quality of paths and all facilities bridleways

Table 3: Yate, Chipping Sodbury, Dodington, Winterbourne and Old Sodbury

• Wapley Common – LNR / SSSI (Nearly)
• Kelston Close – PF (Multi Use Games Area) – 3x Play Area
• Lilliput Park
• Yate Common – Wildlife/ Recreation/ Football
• Kingsgate Park
• Brimsham Fields
• Brimsham Park
• Allotments
• Burial Grounds
• The Ridings
• Peg Hill
• Ridgewood
• Wapley Bushes
• Brand Ash Park
• Goose Green
• Cycle Lanes
• Frome Valley W/Bourne
• Frome Valley Walk Way
• Winterbourne Medieval Barn

What’s missing? Yate & Group

• Exciting Play Areas – For all
• Horse Riding off Routes (off Road)
• Provision for Bridle Paths
• Public Rights of way
• Maintenance of P.O.S – How will/ can it be managed?
• More sports pitches – better drainage/ Quality
• Access – Accessible land
• Walking
• Dog Walking
• Cycle Paths
• Allotments

Overarching Value given to a variety of open spaces and always need more

Future

• Manage existing spaces better
• Monitoring Protection
• Mow the first Metre only – Off Roadway
• Plan Accessible Routes
• Infrastructure in place 1st
• Improved access to schools facilities
• Exciting Formal and Informal play facilities
• Barnhill quarry – Opportunities?

Plans in Place

• Woodchester park – Play builder
• Developments – Long drive and Millside
• Youth Café – Yate L.C – Including Meeting rooms
• Ridings w/Bourne – New sports hall

Joint Facilities

• Networking
• TRUST – Run Facilities
• Interest Group
• Multi – PURPOSE
Table 4: Thornbury

**Now**

**Sport and Recreation**

- Thornbury Rugby Club (Rockhampton)
- Rockhampton Cricket Club
- Chantry Playing Fields – pitches and amenity space
- Mundy Playing Fields are hugely important to Thornbury –
  - it is a focal point for the community
  - used for lots of community activities, e.g. the carnival, fireworks etc
  - has a number of formal sports pitches
  - very good accessibility from town centre – footpaths and PROW links
  - good children’s play area
  - skate park

**Informal**

- Woods behind leisure centre
- Fishponds (near Park Farm) – opportunity for better/increased use
- Stream side walks/paths – used to be very popular with local kids etc for informal play
- Osprey Park
- Streamleaze – with 'play leaders'
- Sensory Garden

- People often complain about kids playing in areas not specifically designated for play

**Allotments**

- Daggs Allotments (top of High St) - established in 1546, thought to be among the oldest allotments in the country.
- Not enough allotment provision – often seen as being a low priority
- There is potential for a new allotment site to the rear of the Sixth Form Centre
- As private gardens (home) are getting smaller – it was stated that the need for allotments is increasing
- Space has been donated for allotments in Alveston and Ham Lane (Oldbury)

**Rights of Way**

- Thornbury Town Council has undertaken a mapping exercise of all rights of way
- None in Thornbury itself for horse-riding
- Limited bridleways in the area – not enough connectivity between existing bridleways
- There is a high density of horse riders in the area, especially in Alveston, Olveston, Rockhampton and Old Down
- Toll Rider provides vital links
- There are a number of physical barriers to riding – A38, rivers, fences etc
Indoor Sports facilities

- Thornbury Leisure Centre
  - Has everything needed for the existing community
  - Needs updating/modernising – equipment is dated, how environmentally friendly is the building itself?
  - Some school groups have stopped using the facility as they do not get exclusive access to swimming pool etc
    - Other pools locally have better security/lifeguarding arrangements
    - Resulting in a reduction in income
- Castle School
- Chantry is used by a number of local groups and classes e.g. ballet, dance etc
- Armstrong Hall
- Various churches (and church halls) contribute too

Cemeteries/Churchyards

- Provide areas for quiet reflection
- High value in terms of biodiversity
- Lots of capacity. No issues.

Other

- Thornbury in Bloom plays an important part in the appearance of the town – also has a unifying effect
- Cycle paths are well used – could do with more through shared use/multi-use paths, and with increased connectivity/integration of routes
- Eastland Avenue (Playbuilder Project - £75k)
- Reduce the amounts of pesticides used in maintenance programmes

Future

- Ageing allotments – need more for variety of reasons
- Potential for new allotments behind the Leisure Centre is being explored
- Need for more junior football pitches for Thornbury Falcons
- New all-weather pitch at Marlwood School planned through maintaining existing provision
- Do not want to lose any of what is currently there – but there is a need to update the existing facilities/provision and improve quality
- Could do with more opportunities for free exercise
- Clean up Fishponds (near Park Farm) – currently maintained by Avon Wildlife Trust – needs coppicing and opening up
- Make Thornbury more self-sufficient in terms of sports provision (so no need to travel out of town to use facilities etc – point made in respect of Thornbury Falcons) and in terms of local food production/cultivation etc
- Encourage more cycling, make it a more viable, safe option – integrate provision for different non-car transportation modes
- Increase use of streamside walks – check whether it is OK for use as a bridleway
- Increase maintenance of footpaths and PROW
- Improve signage etc
- Wider pavements for cycling etc? are there legal standards for minimum width
• Need to make sure that levels of provision are increased in line with population growth – need to avoid over stretching resources  
• More trees should be planted as they bring multiple benefits  
• Bring neglected areas back into use – Castle School and Marlwood are beginning to try to make better use of the full extent of their playing fields etc  
• Valuable skills of food production/cultivation are being lost – people should be encouraged (through incentives?) to grow their own food etc – there should be local groups/champions to support new initiatives  
• Encourage better use of land in Thornbury by community groups etc – people do care about their areas – can people adopt areas for community use? need to speak with Dave Morrisson (SGC Community Spaces Manager)  
• There was support for the introduction of a walking/cycling/riding day – where people can move around Thornbury without their car  

**Group 5: Rural and other**

• Tina Rainey – S.G.C  
• David Soar – Bitton PC.  
• Veronica Soar – Bitton PC.  
• Mike Thomas – Bitton PC.  
• Sue Hope –  
• Claire Young – Westerleigh  
• Sue Watt – Inglestone  
• Jennifer Farleigh – BHS  
• Hazel – Hawkesbury PC.  
• Martin Smith – Pucklechurch  
• Paula Evans – Iron Acton PC.  
• Lynne Blanchard – Iron Acton Pc.  
• John Broad – Wickwar  

• Facilities for young people, Play Areas and sport Facilities  
• 5 Yr Olds – Need to be close o community – on doorstep  
• Changing Rooms – Poor state infrastructure is poor supporting Facilities  
• All ages (inc teenagers) need to have space  
• “Urban area haven’t facilities so puts pressure onto rural areas”  
• 5 teams for 2 pitches – looks good on paper but reality is different  
• perception that teenagers are problems need to promote positive aspects  
• Youth groups using village halls – Cannot gain access due to high demand of community buildings  
• Pitches – Only used at weekends – Formal sports facilities aren’t used during weekdays  

**Now**

**Parks and Gardens, Rural Areas**

Aonb’s Westonbirt  
Parks – Flower Beds dedicated time – Visit  
Dyrham Park – Formal paying fee  
Badminton –  
Tennis Courts often in parks – not available in rural areas
• Iron Acton 4 ½ acres from private land owner – 2x tennis courts + under 11’s streams, benches
• Hawkesbury – No such facility
• Bitton – Small garden areas with benches + bushes (Amenity area)
• Coalpit Heath- Community garden – area to sit and reflect
• Sometimes provision isn’t good as you would expect with settlements surrounded by greenery “ P.C. have to buy land of local farmers e.g. Iron Acton
• Residents have to travel into towns to use facilities
• If other facilities are available not so much of an issue
• “If you haven’t had it – you don’t miss it”

Indoor Sports / Schools

• Use of school grounds needed to compensate for low provision of open space
• Village Halls – Used for sports badminton, dancing (no squash – need to travel to urban centres) Transport required
• Short Fall & Investment needed
• Trust Run – Small, dedicated but exhausted people to look after them
• Money needed to invest
• Village halls are more Multi functional

Blood, Fish and Bones Church yards and Allotments

• Not enough allotments – Waiting list
• Churchyards. Wildlife Friendly “living churchyards”
• Functional use + Also people visit them to reflect
• Maintenance – Funded by Parish Councils (Bitton)

Natural Areas + PROW

• Publicly Accessible
• Parish Plan 1200 juried 80% said need more of it (Pucklechurch)
• Information needed – To let people know its there
• Accessed by car – To start the journey
• Information for footpaths limited
• Bridleways – not in good state
• Old b/w blocked – CIRCULAR RIDES needed for rides or interlocking rides
• Problem with getting to these, B/W – Need to use rural roads – Rat runs. Safe routes required and planned for
• Big Gap between GI Strategic plans. Dramway Bristol and Bath Path
• “Motorways, A roads, B roads” Tier of paths –? Approach to kissing gate installation. Need direct resources efficiently
• PROW are not accessible
• During Development, Houses and Stables – PROW must be consulted as not lose them – s106 Contribution to mountain them
• 2x Village Green – Iron Acton linked to Frome Valley

Future – What are the Pressures of a New Development

• Housing boom in 70’s hasn’t delivered so we are staring from a poor position. Few facilities catch up required.
Top Three

- Allotments – demand is high now “pressure enormous”
- Consultation- allotments cant be built on – Do not lose anything required
- “Standards” – Pool groups to create support before development begins
- “Evidence building”- Create database of groups – keep local people informed – Parish Councils, Heads
- Get people around the table before developments are submitted

Future Rural

- Save our Green Spaces group is growing
- 48% response rate from Pucklechurch Parish Plans
- Ask questions for new parish plans
- 60% response – Hawkesbury P.C
- Use parish plans for future planning
- Evidence is out there already
- Questionnaire can be used even if plans aren’t published
- Take account of Parish Plans
- Strengths – rural areas are highly valued – If its built on it will no longer be valued
- Rural area provide facilities for urban residents needs to e recognised
- Need to provide local facilities so you don’t need to get into cards
- Village plans – Highlights potential for new spaces
- Survey residents – Wickwar

Now

- Formal area’s – Parks and Gardens
- Natural areas, Nature reserves
- Play areas for children
- Facilities for young people – Skate Parks
- Outdoor Sports facilities – Football, Golf etc
- Amenity Areas – Shared garden spaces
- Cemeteries and Churchyards
- Allotments
- Public Rights of Way – Maintained and Tracks
- Indoor Sports facilities – Trusts
- Indoor Hall – Community hall e.g. Access dance clubs

Rural

- Parish Plans- Who Do We Send Them To in South Glos?
- Parish to Acquire land – Allotments, playing fields, youth facilities
- More investment for facilities – Community land Trusts
- Affordable Housing – For all local residents currently – Don’t Qualify of local housing

GI Needs to take into account transport, building (affordable housing)
### Attendance List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address and/or Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April Begley</td>
<td>Safer and Stronger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Brenchley</td>
<td>New Communities SGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Evans</td>
<td>Iron Acton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val Lee</td>
<td>Siston Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Smith</td>
<td>Siston Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Creasy</td>
<td>Three Brooks Nature Conservation group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Watt</td>
<td>BHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Janley</td>
<td>BHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Heather Goddard</td>
<td>SGC &amp; Hanham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr John Goddard</td>
<td>SGC &amp; Hanham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Wilson</td>
<td>Wildlife Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Wilson</td>
<td>Wildlife Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcom Stephen</td>
<td>Wildlife Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Hutchinson</td>
<td>Filton TC SGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Craig</td>
<td>NHS South Glous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Hunt</td>
<td>SGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica</td>
<td>B.P.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Son</td>
<td>B.P.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Smith</td>
<td>Pucklechurch P.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Sherett</td>
<td>SGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Gardiner</td>
<td>SGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Parfitt</td>
<td>SGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Fay</td>
<td>BHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Hunt</td>
<td>SGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie Tyrrell</td>
<td>SGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demy Jordan</td>
<td>BHS/Sustainable Thornbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marian Stephens</td>
<td>Sustainable Thornbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Cary</td>
<td>CYP SAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Lambert</td>
<td>Resident of Hanham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Cferl</td>
<td>Resident of Cock Road Ridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downend &amp; Bromley Heath Parish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Lewis</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Thomas</td>
<td>SCG - Bitton Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len Criney</td>
<td>Sport England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>Patchway Sports Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Bishop</td>
<td>Patchway Sports Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Blanchard</td>
<td>Iron Acton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brett Harmon</td>
<td>Sustainable Thornbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felicity Horsison</td>
<td>Sustainable Thornbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Young</td>
<td>SGC Cllr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Gillies</td>
<td>SGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Climone</td>
<td>W.P.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Mayer</td>
<td>Dodington PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Heaney</td>
<td>SGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Bleaken</td>
<td>Hawkesbury Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Heps</td>
<td>SGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina Willcock</td>
<td>Lincombe Barn Friends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>