

# **South Gloucestershire Core Strategy**



## **Regulation 30(1)(e) Statement of Representations to the Pre-Submission Core Strategy**

**March 2011**

## Contents

		Page
1.	Introduction	1
2.	Representations received	2
3.	Main Issues raised	3
	<i>Chapters 1 - 10</i>	3
	<i>Chapters 11 - 18</i>	27
	<i>Chapter 19, Glossary, Appendices, Key Diagram</i>	43
	<i>General Issues</i>	46
	<i>Sustainability Appraisal</i>	47
Appendix 1	List of Respondents	48
Appendix 2	Core Strategy Pre-Submission Publication Draft – Engagement Statement	Separate document

## 1. Introduction

---

1.1 The purpose of this Statement is to fulfil Regulation 30(1)(e) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008 and 2009, by setting out the number of representations received to the Pre-Submission Publication Draft Core Strategy and providing a summary of the main issues raised in those representations. It is not a full record of all the issues raised by representations and does not contain the representations in detail. Details of the consultation and engagement carried out under Regulation 27 are set out in the **Core Strategy Engagement and Consultation Statement** at Appendix 2 .

1.2 In addition to the duly-made representations received, internal comments were received from Council officers. These have been considered by the Council and appropriate changes are suggested in respect of ecology and biodiversity, heritage, pollution and public art in the Schedule of Proposed Changes.

1.3 This Statement comprises the issues set out in the Schedule of Comments Summary Report presented to Council on 15<sup>th</sup> December 2010, and posted on the Council's website, with minor amendments relating to consistency and presentation and the removal of internal officer comments.

1.4 Section 3 of this Statement sets out the summary of the issues by Core Strategy chapter with comments on the Sustainability Appraisal included at the end, as follows:

*Chapters 1 – 10      Introductory chapters, Vision & Objectives, strategy, general policies*

*Chapters 11 – 18      Spatial area policies*

*Chapter 19, Glossary, Appendices, Key Diagram, general issues*

*Sustainability Appraisal*

## 2. Representations received

---

2.1 The Council received 2,281 representations, including 17 to the Sustainability Appraisal, from 916 different people and organisations. All representations have been registered as support or objection, although the support category also includes those representations which made a comment but not as an objection. Several respondents stated that they supported a policy but then suggested minor changes, so these representations have been registered as objections.

Objections	1,970
Support	310
Unassigned <sup>1</sup>	1
<b>Total Representations</b>	<b>2,281</b>

<sup>1</sup> Unassigned at the request of the respondent

2.2 Many respondents did not use the forms provided and so did not specify whether or not the document was legally compliant or sound.

Legally compliant	310
Not legally compliant	91
No answer	1,880
<b>Total Representations</b>	<b>2,281</b>

Sound	28
Unsound	1,061
No answer	1,192
<b>Total Representations</b>	<b>2,281</b>

2.3 The list of respondents is set out in Appendix 1. A schedule of all the responses and a scanned copy of the original representations is available on the Council's website and can be viewed [here](#).

### 3. Main issues raised

---

3.1 The following is a summary of the main issues that have been raised by the representations. Therefore, not all representations are referenced. It should also be noted that some respondents made similar points in relation to different parts of the Core Strategy. Therefore a single issue may have been recorded more than once. This summary presents an issue in relation to the most appropriate part of the document. The summary generally follows the order of the Core Strategy document.

#### Chapter 1 – Introduction

(excluding paragraphs 1.2, 1.10 - 1.13, 1.18 - 1.21 & 1.35 -1.40 which concern the Strategy for Development – covered under Chapter 4)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
18	2	1	7	12

3.2 Around half of the objections were from members of the community expressing concerns over the public consultation. Other objections concerned updating and points of clarification, including to the SPD timetable and the replacement of saved local plan policies. These objections were predominantly from developers.

#### Chapter 2 – Setting the Scene

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
5	1	0	4	2

3.3 The objections covered the following points:

- The inter-relationship of Yate and Chipping Sodbury is not recognised;
- The benefits of development at Severnside are not recognised;
- Incorrect spelling of Cotswolds AONB;
- Potential archaeological significance of the Severn Estuary not recognised (English Heritage);
- Include cost of moving goods in reference to congestion.

## Chapter 3 – Key issues

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
30	16	1	19	16

3.4 Objectors included developers, individuals, South Gloucestershire Councillors, Filton College, Friends of the Earth, English Heritage and Avon Wildlife Trust.

3.5 Supporting comments were received from developers, South Gloucestershire Councillors, a Housing Association, the Highways Agency, NHS South Gloucestershire, CPRE and Avon Wildlife Trust.

3.6 The main issues identified were:

### General

- Add resource depletion and fuel price escalation as a key issue. In particular, the issue of Peak Oil should be reflected in decisions over the timescale of this strategy;
- Suggest a matrix is included in the plan which shows how the issues and objectives relate to the policies in the Core Strategy. This will help future monitoring;

### Key Issue 2 – Managing Future Development

- Issues identified were connected with objections to the Strategy for Development (evidence for overall level of development, level of housing need, significance of South Gloucestershire in the sub-region);

### Key Issue 3 – Maintaining Economic Prosperity

- Object to the strategy on the grounds that it should provide for more employment in the Bristol North Fringe and Thornbury;
- There is no mention of skills development which must play a significant part in ensuring that the workforce has appropriate skills to ensure economic prosperity;

### Key Issue 4 – Providing Housing for All

- Issues identified relate to objections to the strategy for development and Policy CS15 (evidence for level of housing need, lack of five year land supply, over reliance on larger sites and promotion of smaller green field sites and the relationship between housing and economic growth);

### Key Issue 5 - Improving Existing Communities

- Detailed comments made in relation to the development of brownfield sites particularly in rural areas and the relationship between housing and town centre growth;

- Is there provision for the expansion of out of town centres and new district centres if they are needed?

Key Issue 6 – Tackling Congestion and Improving Accessibility

- The Core Strategy should acknowledge the role of developer funding in providing highway improvements;
- The key role of central government funding for infrastructure should be acknowledged;

Key Issue 7 – Managing Environmental Resources and Heritage

- Refer to broader historic environment in line with PPS5 and include reference to the protection of locally important assets (English Heritage & Avon Wildlife Trust);
- Issue should be worded more flexibly as development can be achieved sensitively without undermining environmental assets;
- Detailed comments about the implementation of policies.

## Chapter 4 – Vision, Strategic Objectives and Strategy for Development

### a) Vision

*The following summary includes representations made to the Vision, either where set out in Chapter 4 or in the various chapters in Part 2 of the Core Strategy (chapters 12-17).*

#### Vision for 2026 and beyond

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
5	8	2	2	9

3.7 The main issues raised by Friends of the Earth and Sustainable Thornbury related to the inclusion of adaptation to peak oil and the suggestion to add climate change mitigation to the text. The other objections related to the strategy for development.

3.8 Statements of support were received from Natural England, UWE, the Highways Agency and developers.

#### Vision for the North Fringe

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
1	5	1	0	5

3.9 Avon Wildlife Trust suggested including the natural environment as a key theme within the vision.

#### Vision for the East Fringe

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
5	1	0	2	4

3.10 One objector made the point that the vision will only be achieved if development is sympathetically controlled and the Green Belt protected, while other objections were connected to the locational strategy for the area by those promoting development in the Green Belt. Further objections considered that the vision should include more ambitious plans for improving the management and access to green space including Commons management plans, more public access and reforestation. Avon Wildlife Trust suggested amended wording to include references to wildlife and climate change.

#### Vision for Yate and Chipping Sodbury

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
6	2	0	5	3



3.11 The Vision in general was supported by those responding to the Core Strategy. Objections have been received from the promoters of the land north of Brimsham requesting alterations to the final sentence of the vision in order to provide clarity about the mix of uses and the purpose of housing development; namely that it will meet locally generated housing requirements. Developers of alternative sites put forward for allocation request that the Vision be altered to reflect the ability of their sites to come forward.

#### Vision for Thornbury

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
4	1	0	0	5

3.12 Most representations received specifically related to the proposed housing development at Park Farm, with respondents doubting that housing development will solve the challenges facing Thornbury. Sustainable Thornbury do not think that the vision as drafted will encourage Thornbury's self containment.

#### Vision for Severnside

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
4	1	0	2	3

3.13 Comments received suggested that a stronger emphasis should be made regarding power generation, while others objected to the inclusion of any reference to power generation. Another objection related to the strategy for development. The Highways Agency requested the insertion of a requirement to ensure the Strategic Road Network is protected.

#### Vision for the Rural Areas

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
6	1	0	4	3

3.14 5 representations from developers/agents and 1 from an environmental interest body were made specifically objecting to the vision. All matters raised by the developers/agents are also the subject of representations to the strategy of the Core Strategy and Policy CS34 (Rural Areas). A statement of general support for the vision was received from a South Gloucestershire Councillor.

3.15 The objections covered the following points:

- That the vision is unnecessarily prescriptive, restricts new development in the rural areas and should make reference to groups of associated settlements and providing housing to create sustainable communities (the objections seek to allow development of specific identified sites not related to local need);
- Reference should be made to the development of renewables being caveated by constraints such as biodiversity, heritage and the unique character of the countryside.

## b) Strategic Objectives

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
21	9	1	10	19

*The following summary includes representations made to the Objectives, either where set out in Chapter 3 or in the various policy chapters in Part 1 of the Core Strategy (chapters 5-10).*

3.16 The objections were mainly from developers, interest groups and specific consultees including English Heritage, Natural England, Friends of the Earth, Friends of Bristol Suburban Railways and the Coal Authority.

### Overarching & Cross-cutting Objectives

- Include reference to rising oil prices;
- Add “and more affordable” to sustainable communities objective;

### Tackling Congestion and Improving Accessibility

- Add new objective concerning the re-opening of various train stations;
- Remove “bus” from Bus Rapid Transit;
- Cyclists and pedestrians should have priority over motorists;

### Managing Future Development

- Include securing the re-development of brownfield land as a new objective;
- Objectives are at odds with the objective to protect the Green Belt and countryside;
- Add new objective on providing sufficient new housing to meet need and demand and to support economic growth;
- Add new objective to allow further housing in villages with higher levels of services and facilities;

### Managing Environmental Resources and Built Heritage

- Use broader definition of the historic environment than “built”;
- Add new objective to protect best and most versatile farmland from development;
- Add safeguarding mineral resources as an objective;

### Providing Housing and Community Infrastructure

- Replace “Providing a range of housing” with “providing sufficient housing”.

3.17 Other objections were concerned with the implementation, rather than the wording of the objectives, and raised issues covered in other summary reports. One objection promoted the inclusion of a definition for sustainable development.

### c) Strategy for Development

(Chapter 1, paragraphs 1.2, 1.10 - 1.13, 1.18 - 1.21 & 1.35 -1.40

Chapter 4, paragraphs 4.3 - 4.29

Chapter 6, Policy CS5 & paragraphs 6.5 - 6.11

Chapter 10, Policy CS15 & paragraphs 10.6 -10.11)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
253	33	4	129	153

3.18 There is an amount of double counting in the objection numbers, as a significant proportion of objectors made the same comments each time the Strategy was referred to in different sections of the Core Strategy document. These objections also duplicate many of the objections which have been recorded for the individual area chapters in Part 2 of the Core Strategy (Chapters 12 – 18). *A number of objections are dealt with in the area chapter summaries, as they raise issues that are not specifically related to the strategy.*

3.19 The spatial breakdown of these comments is:

	Object	Support
<b>Overall approach of the Strategy</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>North Fringe</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>East Fringe</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Yate/Chipping Sodbury</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Thornbury</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Rural Areas</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Sevenside</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>

3.20 While comments on the strategy were made by a cross section of interests, including members of the public, the greatest numbers of comments were made by developers, landowners and agents.

3.21 This section is presented in 2 parts; the first dealing with the strategic issues raised and the second covering more detailed objections.

### **Part 1 – Strategic Issues**

#### **Overall Approach of the Strategy**

- The strategy is premature – it doesn't reflect the Government's policy on the protection of Green Belt, the localism agenda and the revocation of the RSS;
- Housing figures are too high – housing numbers should be reassessed with new evidence and consultation – the economic situation has changed and there is no guarantee of transport infrastructure improvements to support these numbers. Local need should be used as the indicator of required provision;
- Housing figures are too low - various alternative figures up to 34,000 suggested. Policy CS15 doesn't fulfil the requirements of PPS3. The strategy does not deliver a 5 year supply of housing land;

- There is an over-reliance on major sites which may have delivery issues. The strategy should include more, smaller sites which are deliverable including green field/Green Belt sites;
- Concern about the impact of the removal of green field land inside motorway network on quality of life, biodiversity, etc;
- The strategy should not just focus on first 10 years;
- Object to references to “unidentified brownfield” as part of 5 year land supply and windfalls post 2022;
- Object to building on the Green Belt;
- Any incursion into the Green Belt should occur only where special circumstances can be demonstrated and the strategy should compensate for land taken out of the Green Belt by taking other land in;
- There is inconsistency between how different areas of South Glos are treated with regard to Green Belt;
- More land should be released from the Green Belt to ensure that a sufficient quantum and range of development opportunities exists. It is inconsistent with national policy to consider large Green Belt sites without considering smaller sites and to minimise the need to adjust Green Belt boundaries;
- The strategy should include a commitment to review Green Belt, setting timescale and parameters. Any review must:
  - Include land west of M5 including Over and Easter Compton,
  - Enable further contribution towards balancing employment needs across the district e.g. expansion of Hanham Business Park,
  - Allow for affordable housing sites to be identified on the edge of rural settlements in Sites & Policies DPD;
- Lack of evidence to support housing numbers;
- No testing of alternative growth strategies;
- There is insufficient evidence on planned infrastructure to support new development e.g. JLTP3 is not ready;
- There is no flexibility to allow for significant delays in development of the major sites - this will result in a shortfall of provision;
- Question realistic delivery of sustainable development with some proposals;
- No evidence is provided to support delivery of the SGLP allocations given viability issues;
- The Strategy is inconsistent with the last sentence of para 4.4 due to reliance on significant public infrastructure and the release of land from the Green Belt before development can take place;

### **Strategy for the North Fringe of Bristol urban area**

- Post 2016 proposals for Cribbs and Harry Stoke may have direct implications for the strategic road network, as well as services and facilities in existing communities;
- Allocate land east of M32 and north of A4174 at Hambrook;
- Strategy takes no account of decision on Frenchay Hospital;

### ***Land East of Harry Stoke***

- Land East of Harry Stoke should not be dependent on delivery of the Stoke Gifford Transport Link (SGTL);
- If the land for the SGTL fulfils a Green Belt function, then an alternative route should be sought (paragraph 4.17);

- There is no rationale for the phasing restriction on land East of Harry Stoke;

#### *Cribbs/Patchway*

- Object to any phasing that would preclude development of Cribbs/Patchway before 2016 (IDP shows phasing commencing 2013);
- No evidence to demonstrate that need for land to west of A4018 at Cribbs will only arise after 2020 and does not accord with para 2.12 of PPG2 in that Green Belt boundaries may need to be altered during or at the end of the plan period;
- Object to possible removal of Green Belt west of A4018 and affect on setting of Spaniorum Hill.

#### **Strategy for the East Fringe**

- No justification for removing proposal for an urban extension in this area. Reference should be made to the Colin Buchanan Strategic Green Belt Review which identified an Area of Search for an urban extension north east of Greater Bristol (part of RSS evidence base);
- Urban extensions or smaller developments within the Green Belt proposed at:
  - Shortwood Golf Course,
  - Hanham,
  - Barry Road Oldland,
  - Williams Close, Longwell Green,
  - Bromley Heath (employment land);
- Latest assumptions for Emersons Green East are 3,050 dwellings and 19ha employment land not 2,750 as stated in the Draft Core Strategy;

#### **Strategy for Yate & Chipping Sodbury**

- Object to 3,000 houses now that the RSS has gone;
- Include more housing at Yate/Chipping Sodbury;
- The 3,000 houses proposed at Yate should be spread around towns and villages in South Gloucestershire for affordable housing and elderly only;
- Object to omission of land:
  - East of St John's Way, Chipping Sodbury,
  - Engine Common,
  - North Yate (Home Farm);
- Proposed phasing of housing at north Yate is unachievable;
- Allow delivery before current timescale;
- Amend reference to new sewer connection (paragraph 4.24);

#### **Strategy for Thornbury**

- Object to 500 new houses in Thornbury - development should be based on meeting local needs, both market and affordable;
- Thornbury needs more housing - minimum 750 and up to 1,000 houses required;
- Any new housing should be spread over several smaller sites. Sites proposed at Morton Way South and within the Green Belt at Bristol Road, as well as at Park Farm;

- Object to revitalising the town centre as a justification for new housing at Thornbury;
- Support strategy for achieving more self-containment, but some of the features of Policy CS32 will not achieve it e.g. need to address why existing residents don't use town centre enough;
- Park Farm housing can be delivered sooner than identified in Policy CS15;

### **Strategy for the Rural Areas**

- Settlement boundaries should be reviewed now not in 5 years – they are historic and are preventing an adequate supply of rural housing including affordable housing. Some rural communities without boundaries are prevented from having any new development;
- Policy should identify new development in some villages or groups of villages where there are facilities and services. Development should assist in creating sustainable communities or sustain existing communities;
- Existing rural settlements should be increased by 15/20% through sympathetic extensions. Remove reference to “small scale”;
- Specific sites identified as locations for growth (Charfield and Coalpit Heath);
- Allow small scale sites in rural areas to come forward in current economic climate to compensate for delivery issues which are affecting larger sites;
- Development must be for local needs only and not add to existing congestion on strategic road network;

### **Strategy for Severnside**

- Clarify why new link road and M49 Junction are in the Core Strategy when not in Draft JLTP3;
- Objective to deliver principally warehousing and distribution operations is overly restrictive and contrary to Policy EC2.1b of PPS4;

### **Major Infrastructure Projects**

- Include in text that strategy does not take into account potential new nuclear power station development at Oldbury on Severn.

## ***Part 2 - Detailed points and non-strategic matters***

3.22 In addition to the above, objections have been raised to the detailed wording of the Strategy for Development sections of the Core Strategy. In some cases these points are addressed in other sections of the Core Strategy:

- Add reference to green infrastructure;
- Improve references to protection of environment and heritage;
- Add more stations within enhanced public transport measures;
- Indicate that prior extraction of surface coal resources should be a consideration for development proposals.

## Chapter 5 – High Quality Design and Responding to Climate Change

### Policy CS1- High Quality Design

(including paragraphs 5.1- 5.18)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
44	7	2	15	34

3.23 The majority of objections were made by developers, agents and interest groups.

3.24 Three objections considered the policy to be too long, complex and onerous. All other objections related to issues of emphasis or were of a minor technical nature. The main technical issue raised was related to sustainable construction standards. Members of the public and pressure groups generally seek higher standards, whilst development industry representatives are seeking greater flexibility and viability to be taken into account.

3.25 Other points made included:

- The need for greater clarity of what constitutes ‘a scheme of sufficient scale or significance’ – criteria 4;
- Whether ‘fresh, contemporary’ design should be encouraged;
- The need for greater flexibility with regard the retention of existing features – criteria 3;
- Why Building for Life ‘very good’ is only promoted on sites of more than ten dwellings;
- Whether small-scale development could contribute to public art objectives.

### Policy CS2 – Green Infrastructure

(including paragraphs 5.19 – 5.34, Figure 1 and Appendix 3 : Green Infrastructure Assets)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
22	7	0	9	20

3.26 The main issues raised were for noting, minor amendments and suggestions to improve clarification. The majority of responses, therefore, were not suggesting significant policy changes. Objections were received from The Woodland Trust, developers, parish councils, housing associations, individuals, the Environment Agency, Avon Wildlife Trust, the Forestry Commission, Sport England and English Heritage. Supportive statements were received from Natural England, Avon Wildlife Trust, developers, the Joint Local Access Forum, parish councils and British Waterways.

3.27 The main points raised were:

- The inclusion of more detail on woodland protection and creation;
- The expansion of the policy to recognise the role of private gardens;

- Recognition of the importance of access to the foreshore;
- Improve clarity on the scope and status of the Green Infrastructure Strategy;
- Include the protection of agricultural land;
- Include a supportive statement on local food production;
- Include additional detail regarding SUDS/flood storage;
- Question the purpose of the Strategic Principal Functions.

### **Policy CS3 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation** (including paragraphs 5.35 - 5.43)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
20	3	0	9	14

3.28 Just under half of the objections were received from parish councils and individuals. The rest were made up of interest groups and agents.

3.29 The main concerns raised were that the policy was not specific enough on the need to take into account issues of noise and impacts on wildlife, landscape and cultural heritage. Other comments were of a minor technical nature or promoted sites for renewable energy generation.

### **Policy CS4 – Renewable and Low Carbon District Heat Networks** (including paragraphs 5.44 - 5.52)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
14	2	0	5	11

3.30 All representations received were from developers, agents and interest groups.

3.31 The main issues raised were:

- Question the need for a 'technology specific' policy given the pace of change in this area;
- Strengthen criteria 8 of the policy;
- The policy is insufficiently flexible and doesn't take account of financial viability.



## Chapter 6 – Managing Future Development

Policy CS5 – Location of Development and paragraphs 6.5 – 6.11 is covered under Chapter 4 (c) Strategy for Development)

### Policy CS6 - Infrastructure and Developer Contributions (including paragraphs 6.12 - 6.18)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
27	12	1	12	26

3.32 Almost all representations were made by developers, agents and interest groups.

3.33 The main issues raised were:

- The main objection from developers and planning consultants was that the policy should clearly be in accordance with Circular 05/05, i.e. contributions should be necessary, related and reasonable;
- Developers and planning consultants also wanted clarification as to whether South Gloucestershire intends to implement a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL);
- Other objections generally related to specific interests, i.e. the Highways Agency seeking specific acknowledgement of the strategic road network in the list of infrastructure items (para 6.13), Wessex Water seeking scope for contributions towards upgrade of the strategic sewer network and registered social landlords seeking to exclude affordable housing from contributions.

## Chapter 7 – Tackling Congestion and Improving Accessibility

### Policy CS7 – Strategic Transport Infrastructure (including paragraphs 7.1 - 7.14 and Figures 2 & 3)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
49	13	1	20	41

3.34 Approximately a third of the objections were received from parish councils and individuals raising concerns about the impact of development, transport proposals, and effects of congestion.

3.35 Objections included:

- The Highways Agency and the Government Office for the South West were seeking information with regard the impact of development proposals (particularly in the North Fringe) on the Strategic Road Network;
- A lack of emphasis on rail and the potential to re-open local stations;
- Promotion of non-planning powers such as the creation of an Integrated Transport Authority (ITA) and smart ticketing;
- Question marks over the deliverability of transport packages given the impending spending reviews;
- Clarification as to whether the M4 Link and M49 junction are aspirations or part of the Plan;
- Concern that the ring road package will merely exacerbate car use.

### Policy CS8 – Improving Accessibility (including paragraphs 7.15 - 7.22)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
21	3	1	9	14

3.36 Half of the objections were from parish councils, South Gloucestershire Councillors and individuals.

3.37 Parking standards was the issue most commented on:

- Both support and objections to maximum parking standards;
- Challenge the reference to 50% of garages only contributing towards maximum standards as not being based on evidence;
- Advocate an early review of parking standards.

3.38 Other comments were locationally specific or generally supportive. One objector considers rail stations should be added to the list of destinations in criteria 3.

## Chapter 8 – Managing Environmental Resources and Built Heritage

### Policy CS9 – Environmental Resources and Built Heritage (including paragraphs 8.1 – 8.17)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
24	13	0	13	24

3.39 The main points from the objections were:

- Amend definition of the historic environment in line with PPS5, and add a proactive policy to regularly revise the Local List SPD (English Heritage);
- Question consistency of paragraph 8.11 with the policy in respect of the Coastal Zone (Environment Agency);
- Amend policy to address ground stability issues, as required by PPG14 (The Coal Authority);
- Amend policy to emphasise the need to protect tranquillity (Cotswolds Conservation Board);
- Strengthen wording of policy to address protection and enhancement of the natural environment and amend supporting text to reflect national legislation and policy (Avon Wildlife Trust);
- Add greater flexibility to the wording of Policy CS9 to increase the potential to bring protected historic buildings in a poor state of repair back into sustainable use (South Gloucestershire Council Labour Group).

3.40 Other points made included:

- Give greater recognition to the distinctive built and natural heritage of the area;
- Expand paragraph 8.13 to emphasise the importance of proactively managing soil for improvement;
- Buffer zones should be introduced for areas designated for conservation;
- Expand paragraph 8.13 to cover “suitable gardens”, e.g. “Land Share” garden schemes;
- Detailed issues covered by existing South Gloucestershire Local Plan policies;
- Points of clarification and the removal of ambiguity in the wording of Policy CS9 and its supporting text;
- Reflect changes in national planning policy (i.e. PPS5)

**Policy CS10 – Minerals**  
**(including paragraphs 8.18 – 8.24)**

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
4	3	2	2	3

3.41 The main issues raised were:

- The Core Strategy should endorse the principle of transferring an old active mineral planning permission to a more suitable mineral working area (The Tortworth Estate);
- Concern that the shallow coal resource would not be safeguarded until the Sites and Policies DPD is produced (The Coal Authority).

3.42 The minerals industry were generally supportive of the policy.

## Chapter 9 – Maintaining Economic Prosperity

### Policy CS11 – Distribution of Economic Development Land (including paragraphs 9.1 - 9.7)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
23	3	0	15	11

3.43 All but one of the objections were from developers, the Regional Development Agency and GWE Business Link.

#### Overall Strategy for Economic Development Land

3.44 The objections were that the strategy does not provide enough land in the right locations to meet the needs of business for the following reasons:

- The strategy would limit the economic potential of the sub-region;
- There is an over reliance on employment land at Severnside where key constraints will limit delivery;
- The proposed new neighbourhood at Cribbs/Patchway would have an adverse impact on Filton Airfield and the wider Aerospace industry and so employment land should be allocated around the airfield rather than residential;
- There is an over reliance on protecting existing employment land in the North and East Fringes of Bristol and so further land should be allocated in these areas;
- Question the quantum of safeguarded land in Yate & Chipping Sodbury given the uncertainty over the level housing provision now that the RSS has been revoked.

#### Site Specific

3.45 A number of developers have made representations seeking the allocation of specific sites for employment land within the Green Belt or on greenfield land:

- Land on the edge of Wickwar,
- Land East of Chipping Sodbury,
- Bromley Heath Road, Downend,
- Land to the east of Bristol urban area,
- Land at Engine Common.

3.46 There were also objections to the safeguarding for economic development of the following sites:

- Cooper Works, Yate,
  - Hunts Ground Road, Parkway,
  - Land at Station Road/Bridge Road, Staple Hill.
-

## Policy CS12 – Safeguarded Areas for Economic Development (including paragraphs 9.8 - 9.15 and Tables 1 & 2)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
19	4	0	13	10

### General Objections

3.47 The same objections were raised as to Policy CS11, in that the strategy does not provide enough land in the right locations to meet the needs of business.

3.48 Detailed comments on the wording of policy and text:

- The approach to offices should be clarified within Policy CS12 rather than in the text;
- The tests set out in Policy CS12 are not in line with PPS4;
- Gospel Halls should be considered appropriate on land safeguarded for economic development.

### Site Specific Objections

3.49 Various developer interests objected to the safeguarding or allocation of the following sites under Policy CS12:

- The Cooper Works, Yate,
- Hunts Ground Road, Parkway,
- Former Kleeneze Site, Hanham,
- Billington Structures, Yate,
- Station Road/Bridge Road, Staple Hill,
- McBraida, Kingswood,
- Amount of economic development land in Yate/north Yate new neighbourhood.

3.50 Proposals were made to safeguard the following **additional** greenfield or Green Belt sites:

- Hanham Business Park extension,
- Harvey Shopfitters, Common Road, Hanham,
- Bromley Heath Road, Downend,
- Land East of Chipping Sodbury,
- Land East of Wickwar,
- Land at Engine Common,
- Land for rail freight infrastructure and access including land at Severnside, Westerleigh Sidings and Chipping Sodbury Station Yard.

## Policy CS13 – Non-Safeguarded Economic Development Sites (including paragraphs 9.16-9.21)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
8	2	0	6	4

3.51 The main issues raised were:

- Object to the policy as currently worded;

- The poorest quality employment land should be released for schemes with a significant proportion of affordable housing;
- Gospel Halls should be allowed on economic development sites as sequentially preferable to mixed use or residential uses;
- Clarify that change of use to residential should only occur when appropriate in terms of flood risk, in line with policy CS9 (Environment Agency).

**Policy CS14 – Town Centres and Retail**  
(including paragraphs 9.22 – 9.30 and Table 3)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
13	6	0	3	16

3.52 The main issues raised were:

- Object to the designation of Patchway as a District Centre due to the adverse impact on existing centres and food stores in the locality, particularly if an anchor food store comes to Patchway (Morrisons);
- Abbey Wood Retail Park should be allowed a convenience food anchor store (The Trustees of Abbey Wood Retail Park);
- Object to the very restrictive approach to new floorspace at The Mall/Cribbs Causeway and a town centre here should be identified in the Core Strategy, rather than deferred until after 2026, together with further comparison floorspace (Owners of The Mall);
- Object to the designation of a town centre at The Mall/Cribbs Causeway (Owners of Yate Shopping Centre);
- Support a new district centre at Sainsbury's/B&Q in Stoke Gifford, but this should be identified before 2026 (Sainsbury's).

3.53 Other objections concerned matters of clarification, the application of retail policy and development management matters and comments on the list of Local Centres in Table 3.

3.54 The University of the West of England support the more flexible use of Abbey Wood Retail Park and the Sainsbury's/B&Q site at Stoke Gifford.

## Chapter 10 - Providing Housing and Community Infrastructure

(CS15 – Distribution of Housing and paragraphs 10.6 – 10.11 is covered under Chapter 4 (c) Strategy for Development)

### Policy CS16 – Housing Density (including paragraphs 10.12 – 10.15)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
17	6	0	12	11

3.55 The objections were principally from developers and consultants, but also included the Environment Agency, parish councils and individuals.

3.56 The main issues raised were:

- The policy is inconsistent with PPS3 now that the 30 dwellings per hectare minimum density requirement has been removed by the Coalition Government;
- The density of 30-40 dwellings per hectare is too high in some areas;
- Use a minimum density target;
- Flexibility is needed to achieve higher densities;
- Concerned about the impact of high density development on character, open space provision, traffic and parking and other design matters.

### Policy CS17 – Housing Diversity (including paragraphs 10.16 – 10.24)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
14	9	0	9	14

3.57 The objections were principally from developers and consultants, but also included the Environment Agency, parish councils, interest groups and the Council's Labour Group.

3.58 The main issues raised were:

- The references to specific housing mixes are overly prescriptive and inappropriate in the policy;
- Housing mix requirements are too inflexible and will give rise to issues of clarity, implementation (particularly on small sites) and delivery;
- Amend wording on development in gardens following the Coalition Government's announcement on "garden-grabbing" and changes to PPS3;
- Object to flat conversions due to their impact on parking and amenity;
- Concerned about car ownership levels with flat conversions.



**Policy CS18 – Affordable Housing**  
(including paragraphs 10.25 – 10.40)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
25	10	0	17	18

3.59 The majority of objections were from developers and agents with 3 from parish councils.

3.60 Over half of the objections relate to the lack of evidence on the economic viability of development sites if a 35% affordable housing target is pursued, and that the policy is not underpinned by a viability assessment.

3.61 Other objections were:

- Concerned about the impact of lowering of the site size threshold;
- The policy does not specifically refer to lower levels of affordable provision where lack of viability can be demonstrated;
- Builders will not have the resources to fund viability assessments, as provided for in the policy;
- The rural site size threshold should be set below five dwellings (Cotswolds Conservation Board (AONB));
- Concerned that ‘blanket’ overall percentages of affordable housing may not be appropriate to rural areas (two parish councils);
- There is too little commitment for ‘affordable housing to buy’ (Local MP);
- Concerned that if attempts are made to impose a local connection qualification for access to affordable housing on market housing sites in rural areas under para 10.36, then (a) this will make it difficult for registered providers to raise funding from lenders to deliver schemes and (b) it is contrary to PPS3 which ties this to local provision on ‘exception sites’;
- Define what level of local connection is required.

3.62 The Council's Labour Group welcomes the proposal that SPD will address the issue of off-site contributions to affordable housing. Two parish councils support the policy as set out.

**Policy CS19 – Rural Housing Exception Sites**  
(including paragraphs 10.41- 10.51)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
10	1	0	4	7

3.63 Objections were made by affordable housing providers, agents, individuals, one parish council, the Council's Labour Group and a South Gloucestershire Councillor.

3.64 The main issues raised were:

- the policy should allow for small scale rural exception sites near communities without settlement boundaries;
- the Council should identify specific sites for rural affordable housing only developments now, rather than as a last resort;
- the requirement for schemes to be initiated or supported by parish councils will reduce and delay the number of sites coming forward and should be a material consideration not an absolute requirement.

3.65 Other points made were:

- it is not reasonable to require a full appraisal of sites for every rural exception site;
- it is unclear how a parish council can “initiate” housing when they are neither a landowner nor a developer;
- the Council should identify settlement boundaries for villages where there are none in order to allow for exception sites under this policy;
- the Council should support market housing delivery in rural areas where this can enable affordable housing delivery;
- requests for clarification with regard to matters to be included in the legal agreements attached to rural exception dwellings, the cascade approach and equality issues in relation to local connection restrictions.

### **Policy CS20 – Extra Care Housing** (including paragraphs 10.52 – 10.61)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
10	7	1	5	11

3.66 The key issues were mainly generated by agents/developers, South Gloucestershire Councillors and NHS South Gloucestershire.

3.67 The main issues raised were:

- Whilst supportive of the principle of trying to promote private sector Extra Care accommodation, the requirement to provide an element of affordable housing will not work and will inhibit rather than encourage delivery of this form of housing;
- Easy walking distances should be defined in the policy;
- Thornbury (CS33) should be added to the list of neighbourhoods in the policy through which Extra Care Housing will be provided owing to its population demographic;
- The policy needs to be broadened to encourage more types of housing for the elderly and disabled;
- Reasonable ancillary facilities should only be provided where necessary and viable;
- Policy must give consideration to flood risk.

**Policy CS21 – Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation**  
(including paragraphs 10.62 – 10.68)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
15	3	0	5	13

3.68 The majority of key issues were raised by community and interest groups, South Gloucestershire Councillors and the Environment Agency.

3.69 The main issues raised were:

- Uncertainty over the continuing development of the Gypsy and Traveller DPD affects the ability of people to respond to this policy. For example, despite making a case that the numbers in the Gypsy & Traveller Area Assessment were too high, it does not make clear what the Council thinks the numbers should be, provide details of how the needed pitches will be delivered and what will happen when a safeguarded site ceases to be safeguarded due to a temporary planning permission;
- The Council should make a commitment to meet needs as identified by the RSS in the timescales required. Even though abandoned, the RSS allocations have resulted from a detailed and considered examination of the evidence base during the EiP and as such form a material consideration;
- Policy is not conformable with Circular 01/2006, casts doubt on the needs and may not deliver in an appropriate time frame - suggest that it should be a criteria based policy;
- It is not feasible, viable or desirable to include pitch provision as part of the new neighbourhoods – there is no justification for this requirement;
- The site at The Meadows, Pucklechurch in the safeguarded list is not authorised;
- Any land provided for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation or caravans must not be located within Flood Zone 3.

**Policy CS22 – Travelling Showpeople**  
(including paragraphs 10.69 – 10.73)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
3	0	0	1	2

3.70 Objections were received from the Highways Agency, Environment Agency and an individual.

3.71 The issues raised were:

- Whether or not the Council's reasoning for the figures in the RSS/GTAA being too high has had independent scrutiny;
- Include criterion in the policy which assesses the highway impact of proposals for sites;
- Any land provided for caravans must not be located within Flood Zone 3.

### **Policy CS23 - Community Buildings and Cultural Activity (including paragraphs 10.74 – 10.80)**

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
10	1	0	7	4

3.72 The majority of objections were made by developers and agents.

3.73 The main points from the objections were:

- Question the relationship the policy has with Government Circular 05/05 (Planning Obligations) and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations. In this respect question the deliverability of the policy;
- Request flexibility in the application of the policy;
- Allocate Gospel Halls/places of worship;
- Expand the list of facilities to include allotments/community gardens;
- Provide a clearer definition of community facilities.

### **Policy CS24 – Open Space Standards (including paragraphs 10.81 – 10.93)**

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
20	4	0	11	13

3.74 Objections were raised by British Waterways, the Wildlife Trust, a residents society, agents, developers, a South Gloucestershire Councillor, two parish councils, Environment Agency, an individual, the Woodland Trust, housing associations, Council for Disabled People, and the South Gloucestershire Liberal Democrat Group. Supportive statements were received from the Avon Wildlife Trust, the Forestry Commission and Filton College. The main issues raised were focused on minor amendments to the policy and clarification on the implementation of the standards.

3.75 The main points from the representations were:

- Ensure flexibility and fairness when applying the standards;
- Introduce more detail and allow for flexible application of the standards;
- Broaden the range of types of space covered by the policy and refer to planting of native trees in the supporting text;
- Local standards need to be fully evidenced and consulted upon;
- Include neighbouring authorities' facilities in the consideration of existing local provision;
- Open space standards should be set out in a DPD rather than SPD if they could be used to refuse a planning application (see Inspector's recommendation to Bristol City Council's Core Strategy).

3.76 In addition minor amendments were suggested, as well as more detailed passages of text to provide greater emphasis and explanation.

## Chapter 11 – Introduction (to Part 2)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
1	0	0	0	1

3.77 An individual queried why Winterbourne and Frampton Cotterell are not shown on the map of the spatial areas in Chapter 11.

## Chapter 12 – Communities of the North Fringe of Bristol Urban Area

### Policy CS25 – Communities of the North Fringe of Bristol Urban Area

(including paragraphs 12.1 - 12.11 and Figures 4 & 5)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
39	11	2	14	34

3.78 Over half of the objections were from developers and commercial interests, with a quarter from parish councils and individuals, and the remainder from interest groups/organisations.

3.79 Developer and commercial respondents tended to focus on specific interests. These included:

- Abbey Wood Retail Park - the landowners are continuing to pursue a large food retail outlet on the former Woolworths site;
- PRUPIM are seeking 'town centre' status for Cribbs Causeway and additional floorspace;
- NHS South Gloucestershire / King Sturge propose that the Frenchay site should be included as a 'mixed-use development (to include health care facilities) in Policy CS25;
- WYG Planning on behalf of Sainsbury's support a new district centre on their Stoke Gifford site before 2026;
- RPS on behalf of Crest seek clarity on the phasing of East of Harry Stoke new neighbourhood.

3.80 Other comments from key stakeholders included:

- The Highways Agency require further information on the impact of proposed development on the Strategic Road Network;
- The Environment Agency seek further information on the impact of development on the Henbury Trym & Ham Brook Catchments. UWE redevelopment and East of Harry Stoke new neighbourhood should be considered together;
- UWE generally support references to the role of the Frenchay Campus in this section;
- Wessex Water wish to pursue financial contributions or works in kind from developers to upgrade the trunk sewer network;
- BAE systems support safeguarding of the airport and note that changes in working practices mean the airport may become redundant during the plan period, hence wish to be involved in master planning of the surrounding area;
- King Sturge on behalf of a private individual is seeking review of the Green Belt around the new wildlife park for development and renewable energy generation opportunities;
- Avon Wildlife Trust and Patchway Town Council are concerned about impact on open space.

3.81 The parish councils and individuals' interests varied but tended to either object in principle to further development, particularly in the Cribbs / Patchway Area, and / or query 'master planning' issues, such as the potential extent and location of green corridors. Patchway Town Council raised concerns about overdevelopment, congestion and the need to safeguard green corridors, such as around the airfield and along the Henbury Trym. Almondsbury Parish Council questioned the definition of the North Fringe (Wyke Beck to Lysander Road is semi-rural). Tytherington Parish Council raised concerns about the loss of Grade I & II agricultural land and Dodington Parish Council raised concerns that increased development would lead to further congestion and therefore reduce opportunity for the people of Yate and Chipping Sodbury.

**Policy CS26 – Cribbs/Patchway New Neighbourhood**  
(including paragraphs 12.12 - 12.19 and Figure 6)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
24	4	1	12	15

3.82 Only two objections were made by individuals. The other representations were made by developers, agents, specific consultees, interest groups and a South Gloucestershire Councillor. Objections to this new neighbourhood are also recorded under CS25.

3.83 A number of developers and their representatives objected to the need and deliverability of a single Concept Plan for the entirety of the area. Other responses tended to focus on master planning issues, such as the extent of green infrastructure, the disposition of land-uses around the airfield and connections with the wider area.

3.84 Other comments from key stakeholders included:

- The Highways Agency require further information on the impact of proposed development on the Strategic Road Network, specifically M5 J17;
- The Environment Agency seek further information (SFRA level 2) on the impact of development on the Henbury Trym & Catbrain Reservoir;
- BAE seek involvement in the master planning process;
- PJ Planning suggest that the proposed quantum of development (1750 dwellings) would not deliver the required infrastructure, hence land west of the A4018 Cribbs Causeway should be allocated;
- CPRE object to loss of open land south of the airfield;
- Avon Wildlife Trust generally welcome the GI approach but raise concerns about impact on the Filton Railway Cutting SNCI.

**Policy CS27 – East of Harry Stoke New Neighbourhood**  
(including paragraphs 12.20 - 12.26 and Figure 7)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
14	2	0	5	11

3.85 No objections were received from individuals or parish councils. Only 1 objection was received regarding the loss of the Green Belt.

3.86 The comments received essentially comprised:

- RPS on behalf of Crest object to the prerequisite of the Stoke Gifford Transport Link and seek greater flexibility on dwelling numbers;
- CPRE object to the loss of Green Belt;
- Baker Associates on behalf of SLP question the deliverability of the site;
- DLP Planning seek inclusion of land east of M32 Jct1 at Hambrook;
- The Environment Agency are seeking further information (SFRA level 2) on the impacts on the Hambrook catchment;
- The Highways Agency require further information on the impact of proposed development on the Strategic Road Network, specifically J1 (M32).

3.87 Other objections generally concern master planning issues, such as the need to include bridleways, the extent of the green corridor adjacent to the motorway, connections to UWE and the use of land under the pylons.

### **Policy CS28 – The University of the West of England (including paragraphs 12.27 - 12.29 and Figure 8)**

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
7	1	0	3	5

3.88 The University of the West of England (UWE) made a number of comments which can be summarised as the following:

- Concern that UWE is being promoted as a ‘focal point for the wider community’ is overstating its role;
- The delivery mechanisms for the Cheswick bus link and rapid transit are yet to be agreed;
- Any planning contributions arising from redevelopment of Frenchay, St.Matthias and Glenside campuses should be considered ‘in the round’ rather than on a ‘plot-by-plot’ basis.

3.89 Other comments concerned master planning issues, such as the need for improved walking and cycling links to Parkway Station, a strategic drainage scheme (Environment Agency) and appropriate healthcare provision for students. The Highways Agency also required further information on the impact of proposed development on J1 (M32).



## Chapter 13 - Communities of the East Fringe of Bristol Urban Area

### Policy CS29 – Communities of the East Fringe of Bristol Urban Area

(including paragraphs 13.1 - 13.11 and Figures 9 & 10)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
41	12	0	3	5

3.90 Approximately half of the objections were from developer and commercial interests, a quarter from parish councils and individuals and the remainder from interest groups, specific consultees and the Council's Labour Group.

3.91 Developer and commercial interests objected on the grounds that housing and/or employment land should be allocated as a result of a review of the Green Belt boundary at the following sites:

- Barry Road, Oldland,
- Bromley Heath Road, Downend,
- Shortwood Golf Course,
- Warmley,
- Hanham Hills,
- Cossham Street/Rodway Hill.

3.92 However, there was also strong community support for the strategy of protecting the Green Belt and landscape setting of the area, as well as for safeguarding employment land and protecting the viability and vitality of the town centres.

3.93 Other comments included:

- The operators of Shortwood Quarry and landfill site (Cory Environmental) want to add reference to the Minerals & Waste Local Plan and Joint Waste Core Strategy in respect of the potential impact of the Emersons Green East development on the operation of the site;
- Concern that the proposals in the policy for facilities and infrastructure to support existing and new development are not adequate, in particular relating to transport (bus services and M4 link) and green spaces;
- Detailed issues relating to development management policy and practice including the need to control conversions of shops to flats and takeaways;
- Detailed objections to Figure 10 and to the lack of reference to bridleways in the policy.

## Chapter 14 – Yate and Chipping Sodbury

### Policy CS30 – Yate and Chipping Sodbury

(including paragraphs 14.1 – 14.15 and Figure 11)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
99	23	0	26	96

### Policy CS31 – North Yate New Neighbourhood

(including paragraphs 14.16 – 14.25 and Figure 12)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
100	6	0	14	92

3.94 The majority of objections were from members of the community. In addition to these, a petition signed by 114 people was submitted by Steve Webb MP opposing the 3,000 houses at north Yate (*this has been included as one representation in the overall figures*). Objections were also received from developers, agents, specific consultees, 6 town and parish councils, the South Gloucestershire Liberal Democrat Group and interest groups

#### Main Points

3.95 The responses were focused on the following points:

- Justification and need for 3,000 homes in the north Yate new neighbourhood;
- The provision of a supermarket at Barnhill Quarry, to the north of Chipping Sodbury;
- Limited housing at Barnhill Quarry, to the north of Chipping Sodbury;
- The anticipated impacts of the developments at north Yate and Barnhill, in particular the transportation (increased out commuting / lorry movements), flooding/drainage and ecological implications;
- Promoting a number of omission sites (sites at Engine Common, north Yate (Home Farm) Coopers Works (the part of the site which is safeguarded for employment use) and Land East of Chipping Sodbury);
- Promoting an additional site for regeneration south of Badminton Road;
- Support for the objective of increasing self containment, but questioning the actual impact home working aspirations would have upon congestion levels;
- Requesting more details on how development impacts will be managed, such as ensuring infrastructure is delivered in advance of the development and how capacity concerns for the town centre can be overcome.

#### Barnhill Quarry

3.96 Concern was expressed about the provision of a medium sized supermarket at Barnhill Quarry north of Chipping Sodbury and similar objections were raised in relation to the limited housing in the same location. These were focused on:

- Impact on the retailers in Chipping Sodbury / questions about the actual need for a supermarket,
- Parking issues,
- Transport/lorry movements,
- Flooding,
- Impact on the SSSI,
- Impact on the character of Chipping Sodbury.

#### North Yate New Neighbourhood

3.97 Many responses highlighted concern about the lack of justification for the strategy to promote this level of development at Yate now that the Regional Spatial Strategy has been abolished. Other comments focused on:

- Flooding/Drainage,
- Visual / ecological impact,
- Environmental impacts,
- Traffic/Congestion,
- Capacity and access to facilities and services,
- Impact upon Yate Rocks,
- Density,
- Local housing need / local housing requirements not reflected,
- Integration with the rest of the town, the distance from the town centre and issues with the capacity of the town centre.

3.98 Some support has been expressed for the new neighbourhood. Some objections state that the site is an appropriate location for development but that 3,000 homes is too many. Respondents, who are opposed to any development on the site, state the conditions that need to be met if development is to regrettably occur, such as the necessary supporting infrastructure.

3.99 Comments from developers in the north Yate area seek the removal of the statements on phasing, to allow development to come forward earlier / more flexibly.

#### Figure 12

3.100 Amendments have been suggested by the major land holder of the north Yate new neighbourhood. The main suggestions are:

- Extending the red line boundary of the site to incorporate land south of Rockwood House to accommodate allotment provision;
- Increasing the provision of green infrastructure across the site (to reflect the floodplain areas);
- Extension of the strategic movement corridor and green infrastructure connections into the Yate Outdoor Sports Complex site;
- A new access point into the site next to Brimsham Green School.

#### Other Representations

- Natural England support, stating that the new neighbourhood should be accommodated without compromising the special identity of Yate Rocks through the retention of a strategic green corridor subject to detailed design;
- The Environment Agency highlight that development at north Yate will impact on catchments, even if development is located outside the flood zones and that a high level catchment assessment should be undertaken;

- Yate Town Council object to the allocation of significant housing numbers and to the specific details contained within the allocations;
- Dodington Parish Council are concerned that the strategy will place even more demands on the, already, overstretched local transport infrastructures;
- Sodbury Town Council highlight concerns over the north Yate new neighbourhood as it would result in a significant increase in traffic accessing the M4;
- Westerleigh Parish Council advocate an integrated approach to planning;
- English Heritage, although supporting Engine Common not being promoted for development, raise concerns about the impact of a new supermarket on the current commercial buoyancy of Chipping Sodbury's shops – a key characteristic of the conservation area.

## Chapter 15 – Thornbury

### Policy CS32 – Thornbury

(including paragraphs 15.1 – 15.9 and Figure 13)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
93	9	1	53	48

### Policy CS33 – Housing Opportunity

(including paragraphs 15.10 – 15.14)

Object	Support	Unassigned	Sound?		
			Y	N	No Ans
626	13	1	4	480	156

3.101 Nearly all objections concern the Housing Opportunity Area identified to the north of Thornbury at Park Farm.

#### Save Thornbury's Green Heritage submission – key points

3.102 A local opposition group Save Thornbury's Green Heritage submitted a substantial representation objecting to the inclusion of the proposal, the summarised key points of which are:

#### *Consultation*

- Previous public consultation used to inform the strategy for Thornbury was insufficient and flawed. Previous consultation does not necessarily support Park Farm as a preferred location for development;

#### *Evidence and justification*

- The need for surplus primary school places to be filled is not justified and there is no evidence to suggest that the development would fill those places. Houses should not be built in order to fill schools and Castle School's aspiration of consolidation onto a single site should not justify the need for more housing;
- It has not been demonstrated that development would increase town centre vibrancy. Competition from the out of centre Tesco supermarket and Cribbs Causeway is the main factor in the town centre's decline. New residents would be likely to drive to these places rather than walk to the town centre to shop;

#### *Sustainability Appraisal*

- Detailed objections submitted relating to unclear and flawed methodology/conclusions and that the rating/scoring system for different options is inconsistent, biased and not supported by adequate evidence;

#### *Location of development and other general comments*

- The Inspector for the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Inquiry did not support development at Park Farm, indicating instead that land at Morton Way would

- be more suitable if development were to come forward;
- Development would harm biodiversity as the area contains Biodiversity Action Plan priority habitats and species;
- Development would harm historic landscape, landscape character, listed buildings and heritage features, residential amenity, agricultural value and the town's wider setting;
- Figure 13 is imprecise and does not give accurate details regarding the extent of development or access onto Butt Lane;
- Proposed area is subject to flooding and development will increase risk of flooding to third parties;
- Housing development not supported by adequate employment opportunities so commuting would increase and residents unlikely to walk/cycle to shops/services. Development would therefore exacerbate traffic congestion at Butt Lane/Gloucester Road and onto the A38. Consolidation of Castle School at the Park Road site would also increase congestion near to Park Road;
- Other sites at Morton Way and adjacent to the town centre are more suitable for development. Development should occur within current town boundaries in the first instance.

#### Other representations from the public

3.103 The majority of objections received were from local residents and echoed one or more points raised by Save Thornbury's Green Heritage. A large proportion were made via a standard representation form drafted and printed by the Save Thornbury's Green Heritage Group. A substantial objection was also received from a Mr Lanfear mainly regarding the way public consultation and the Sustainability Appraisal were undertaken.

3.104 A number of residents suggested that Morton Way would be more suitable for development and some suggested that Castle School should also be rebuilt there with housing then built on the vacated Park Road site. Some also questioned why the Core Strategy does not appear to take account of the development that has occurred in Thornbury in recent years.

3.105 A 120 signature petition was received from people living near to Morton Way requesting that Morton Way not be considered for development (*this has been included as one representation in the overall figures*).

3.106 The majority of objections from residents fall into two broad categories: 1) those which acknowledge the need for some new housing in Thornbury, just not at Park Farm and/or not as many as 500; and 2) those which are against any further housing in principle. Some residents suggested a different amount of housing for Thornbury with between 50 and a maximum of 100-200 being the most common suggestions.

3.107 Residents also highlighted omissions and inaccuracies in Figure 13, as well as identifying a lack of account being taken of the impact on Thornbury of a potential new nuclear power station at Oldbury.

3.108 Representations were also received from the following organisations:

- English Heritage object to the identified housing site as there is no evidence to support the chosen site in terms of its potential heritage impacts;

- Thornbury Town Council and Castle School support the identification of Thornbury as a location for development in the spatial strategy and support the identification of Park Farm as the preferred location;
- Natural England are satisfied that the Thornbury policies will help to address issues identified and accept there is a case for some growth as long as it does not compromise heritage assets;
- The Environment Agency state that whilst Thornbury sits outside the floodplain it does transfer a large proportion of surface water into the network of rhines down at the lower slopes to the estuary. They therefore recommend that a surface water drainage strategy be taken forward to determine how drainage can be improved as a result of the proposals;
- NHS South Gloucestershire support the aim of strengthening health facilities in Thornbury and state that Extra Care housing is required in the town to support the ageing population;
- Sustainable Thornbury suggest that neither the vision nor proposal for housing will encourage self-containment and they suggest land to the west of Thornbury may be more suitable for development. They are also concerned that the figure of 500 dwellings has not been justified or properly appraised;
- Concern for Thornbury echoes several of the points set out by Save Thornbury's Green Heritage and suggests if development is needed then locations to the east or south of the town would be more suitable;
- Oldbury on Severn Parish Council raise concerns regarding potential increased flooding resulting from the development. They suggest that the Environment Agency must be fully involved and that there should be a requirement for regular inspection of any mitigation measures. They also raise concerns regarding the impact of increased traffic on Butt Lane resulting from the decommissioning of the nuclear power station. In addition it is suggested that Tesco and the Mall are among the causes for decline in town centre vibrancy;
- The Council for the Protection of Rural England (Avonside) accept that some more housing is needed in Thornbury.

#### Landowners and developers

3.109 Pegasus Planning, who represent the landowners/developers at the Park Farm site, submitted supporting representations for the vision and proposal for housing but object to some of the wording of Policy CS33, particularly the requirement for the development to provide a new sixth form centre. Instead they argue that the wording of the policy should be compliant with national guidance so that contributions to education are appropriate to the scale of development. Also stated is the assertion that the new dwellings can be delivered faster than proposed in the strategy for development.

3.110 Representations were received from other agents/developers proposing development sites elsewhere around the edge of Thornbury, these being Morton Way north, Morton Way south and west of Bristol Road, which they argue are superior to the site at Park Farm. These detailed representations call for a larger total quantum of development in Thornbury, again to be delivered earlier than indicated in the strategy for development.

## Chapter 16 – Rural Areas

### Policy CS34 – Rural Areas

(including paragraphs 16.1 – 16.18)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
56	6	0	15	47

3.111 A substantial number of objections were raised by parish councils and those with an interest in developing sites. Objections were also raised by individuals, interest groups, specific consultees, South Gloucestershire Councillors and the South Gloucestershire Liberal Democrat Group. 3 statements of general support were made, plus 3 representations supporting different elements of the policy (improvements to public transport links and other supporting services, investigations into the reopening of Charfield Station, the use of Parish Plans as a mechanism for identifying the aspirations of the local communities and the timescale for further consultation, the protection and conservation elements of the policy and the contributions towards new communications technologies).

3.112 The main issues raised were:

- Policy unnecessarily prescriptive and restricts new development in the rural areas. Policy should identify new development in some non Green Belt villages where there are facilities and services and should make reference to groups of associated settlements and their combined provision of services and facilities. Policy should allow for housing and other development which would assist in creating sustainable communities or sustain and develop existing communities;
- Settlement boundaries should be reviewed now not in 5 years – they are historic and are preventing an adequate supply of rural housing including affordable housing. No evidence provided to support the delay in reviewing settlement boundaries. Some rural communities without boundaries are prevented from having new development. Concept plan preparation should be allowed to inform development in advance of the 5 year period of review;
- Identify specific sites for housing development (many sites suggested);
- Parish Plans – clarification sought about the role of these documents as not all communities are intending to prepare plans and some existing plans have not been promoted locally as spatial planning documents. The Parish Plan process must be given necessary support and if necessary the Council should consult specifically on the issue of rural housing distribution (South Gloucestershire Councillors).

3.113 Other points made were:

- Requests for specific footpath/cycle links;
- Objections to any development in the Green Belt around Alveston and Shortwood;
- The inadequacy of infrastructure in the rural areas (drainage and sewage and local roads) and the need to ensure that new development does not lead to flooding;
- Request additional wording to amplify Green Belt clause of policy;



- Add “enhance” to clause 1 of Policy to accord with national environmental planning legislation, biodiversity targets and internal conformity within the Core Strategy. Local biodiversity should be given priority;
- Add “and encourage/promote” local food production to clause 2 of Policy;
- Add healthcare to clause 10 which seeks contributions to infrastructure;
- Tourism and bridleways not mentioned in the Policy or supporting text;
- Decisions relating to employment (clause 7) “should be sympathetic to local concerns in maintaining the character and integrity of the community.” New or additional commercial or agricultural development must be economically viable. Barn conversions should be allowed under the policy;
- Need to retain appropriate employment uses in the countryside that maintain employment levels and acknowledge that some rural enterprises do not sit easily with other uses and the appreciation of the countryside;
- Protecting employment sites fails to recognise the social, environmental and economic benefits that can arise from alternative uses;
- Add tranquillity and conserving and enhancing the AONB to clause 1 of the Policy;
- Communities should have more say/should determine what happens in their communities;
- Severn Beach should be part of the Severnside area;
- Affordable housing difficult to achieve through rural exception sites. Core Strategy should consider other ways of achieving affordable housing, for example a policy which provides one affordable home for every market home built. Restrict extensions to existing homes with a floorspace of say 1,800 square feet to permitted development rights only, in order to keep some houses within the affordability range of the locals;
- No mention of village pubs, schools and shops;
- Reference to rural areas providing a unique and valuable setting to the urban areas should be deleted as the rural areas are communities in their own right and not there as a back drop or setting to the urban areas;
- Suggest changes to tighten the protection given to agricultural land and promote local food production – e.g. Add “and encourage/promote” local food production to clause 2 of Policy;
- Reference to renewables should be caveated by references to constraints such as wildlife, views and landscape and built form etc. Missed opportunity to highlight areas which offer good potential for energy generation;
- Visual intrusion, noise and pollution from motorways are identified as problems but are not addressed in the policy;
- Only development of high quality design is acceptable in villages.

## Chapter 17 – Severnside

### Policy CS35 – Severnside

(including paragraphs 17.1 – 17.23 and Figure 14)

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
23	3	0	8	18

3.114 Objections were raised by developer and commercial interests, the Environment Agency, Bristol City Council, Natural England, the Regional Development Agency, interest groups, individuals, a South Gloucestershire Councillor and the South Gloucestershire Liberal Democrat Group.

#### General comments

3.115 The main issues raised were:

- Bristol City Council suggests a need for increased reference to cross-boundary working;
- The Environment Agency has significant concerns regarding further development increasing flood risk to third parties. Strategic flooding issues require resolution before site specific Flood Risk Assessments should be required. Piecemeal development should be avoided until strategic infrastructure is secured. It is suggested that South Gloucestershire Council should work with Bristol City Council to complete Phase 4 of the Avonmouth/Severnside Flood Risk Study which should inform the Core Strategy;
- The South West Regional Development Agency supports the Council's approach to Severnside as it is a nationally significant area of strategic employment which has potential for enhancement;
- The Bristol Port Company also supports the overall strategy for Severnside, although they question other issues such as the deliverability of necessary transport infrastructure to overcome congestion, as well as suggesting that the Core Strategy should not just focus on the constraints but also the advantages of Severnside for further development;
- The Highways Agency raises doubts over the deliverability of a new M49 junction;
- An individual is concerned about the potential effects of continued development on nearby residents.

#### Policy CS35 and supporting text:

3.116 The main issues raised were:

- The Regional Development Agency suggests that Policy CS35 should lead development at Severnside rather than relying on landowners/developers;
- Landowners and developers object to the pre-requisite for a comprehensive strategy, due to difficulties in reaching consensus between different partners. Flood defences and road infrastructure should not be funded by developers alone and acceptable employment uses should be clearly defined;

- Two objectors consider that Severnside should cover a larger area to facilitate housing and renewable energy development;
- Alder King (for Scottish Power) request that reference be made to the delivery of a new Combined Cycle Gas Turbine (CCGT) power station at Severnside;
- Natural England consider that the policy should be amended to recognise the estuary's legal protection and the Council's responsibility for protecting its conservation interests;
- Avon Wildlife Trust support the creation of Local Nature Reserves;
- Transport 2000 consider that more use should be made of Pilning Station to serve Severn Beach and Severnside;
- Local councillors suggest a number of alterations to the chapter, including making reference to the Highways Agency in the delivery section and adding reference to the re-opening of the Henbury loop to serve commuter traffic.

## Chapter 18 – Major Infrastructure Projects

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
27	8	0	16	19

3.117 Over half of the objections were raised by Horizon Nuclear Power. The remaining objections were predominantly from specific consultees, interest and community groups, individuals, South Gloucestershire Councillors and the South Gloucestershire Liberal Democrat Group.

3.118 The objections raised were:

- Update and correct the text following recent developments;
- Include all key concerns raised in the Council's response to the draft NPSs
- A policy should be included in this chapter;
- The Council is being premature in its assessment of the impacts of potential development as these cannot be examined until details are known;
- Question the justification for a community benefit fund amounting to 10% of build cost as it is excessive;
- The Council should commit to a review of the Core Strategy in the event that the Oldbury on Severn nuclear power proposals are included in the final Nuclear NPS.

3.119 Statements of support were received in relation to the Council's approach and its position towards Major Infrastructure proposals in the area, in support of no nuclear power and suggesting further Severn Barrage discussions.

## Chapter 19 – Implementation and Monitoring

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
4	1	0	0	5

3.120 Objections were received from the Highways Agency, Sport England, a South Gloucestershire Councillor and the South Gloucestershire Liberal Democrat Group.

3.121 The main issues raised were:

- Network Rail should be added to the “Lead Agencies” column of Table 4 under Policy CS35;
- The policies should be monitored annually;
- Concern over the effectiveness of the proposed monitoring of sport and recreation.

## Glossary of Terms

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
2	0	0	0	2

3.122 The objections received relate to updating and the addition of other terms to the Glossary.

---

## Appendices

### Appendix 1- List of Local Plans and Strategies

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
1	0	0	0	1

3.123 Avon Wildlife Trust object to the omission of the Avon Biodiversity Action Plan from the list.

### Appendix 2 - Table of Replaced Local Plan Policies

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
1	0	0	1	0

3.124 The Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways consider that the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Policies T1 (Railway passenger Services and Facilities) and Policy T2 (Retention of Rail Track Beds and Associated Land for Future Public Transport/Rail Freight Use) should be retained as they are generally stronger than the equivalent policies in the Core Strategy.

### Appendix 3 - Green Infrastructure Assets

*Representations received relating to Appendix 3 are considered under Policy CS2 (Green Infrastructure)*

## Key Diagram

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
2	0	0	1	1

3.125 One objection, from a developer, indicates that land to the east of the M49 which benefits from an extant 1957 planning permission should be recognised as forming part of the “Sevenside Committed Site” on the Key Diagram. The other objection, from Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways, requests that 10 railway stations which the group proposes should be opened are shown on the Key Diagram.

## General Issues

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
25	13	1	7	30

3.126 The representations received relate to matters of a general nature, policy omissions or comments which don't fall within a particular chapter/topic, such as those relating generally to the evidence base.

3.127 The main issues raised were:

- Support the need for concept statements for new neighbourhoods and housing opportunities;
- Welcome the Core Strategy as it provides a coherent and positive framework for shaping and managing future development;
- GWE Business West state that the business community supports joint working between authorities; but concerned that the Core Strategy doesn't recognise proposals in neighbouring core strategies;
- General comments on the need to consult with the Civil Aviation Authority, and on electrical distribution and the National Grid;
- Lack of published evidence e.g. sport facilities strategy has not yet been completed;
- General concerns about the adequacy of flooding studies and the assessment of flood risk. Concern that the Bristol Avon Catchment Flood Management Plan dated 2007 is still in draft form [*For information this has now been published.*];
- General comments about re-using empty buildings, conversion rather than demolition, and desire to see new homes built to lifetime homes standard;
- The Core Strategy should be revised to incorporate a more realistic view of the deliverability of the major infrastructure needed to support development;
- General comment on the need to recognise that minority groups can benefit from connections with Bristol;
- Concern about the approach the Core Strategy has on transport and climate change;
- Advocate use of Design Competitions to ensure high quality design that is long lasting e.g. Hanham Hall.
- The Core Strategy is unclear for the lay person to follow and the maps do not show clearly enough where development will occur;
- Policy omissions:
  - Policy to allow the refusal of outdoor heaters, on environmental grounds,
  - Desire from the NHS for the Core Strategy to support the use of Health Impact Assessments,
  - Protection and enhancing of sport and recreation facilities,
  - Policy on Low Impact Developments,
  - Houseboat moorings.



## Sustainability Appraisal Report and Appendices

Object	Support	Sound?		
		Y	N	No Ans
16	1	0	2	15

3.128 The majority of objections were raised by those acting for developers/landowners. Comments were also made by Thornbury interest groups, a service provider, a specific consultee and individuals. One statement of support was received from Thornbury Town Council agreeing with the approach taken to appraise the possible sites for new housing in Thornbury and with the positives and negatives identified

3.129 In addition to these 17 representations, around 500 standard representation forms (printed by Save Thornbury's Green Heritage) were received relating to sustainability issues identified in the appraisal of alternative locations at Thornbury.

3.130 The main issues raised in the objections were;

- The SA fails to justify the provision of land for 21,500 dwellings;
- The SA fails to consider alternative development strategy options, including the option for additional development in the rural areas;
- The SA will need to be updated in response to the revocation of the RSS, the need to increase housing numbers and distribution;
- The need to address more adequately matters relating to Appropriate Assessment.

3.131 Other points made were comments disputing detailed aspects of individual location/site appraisals and the lack of consistency between appraisals.

## List of Respondents

<b>ID</b>	<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>ID</b>	<b>Respondent Name</b>
314913	John Goddard - South Gloucestershire Council Ward Councillor	1060577	Rural Parish Council Judith Payne - Thornbury Town Council
318177	John Phillips - Phillips Planning and Development	1060609	Cate Davidson - Sodbury Town Council
319585	Ann Fay - British Horse Society	1060673	Angela Hocking - Downend and Bromley Heath Parish Council
320737	Tim Roberts - DLP Planning Ltd	1060705	Louise Langdon - Almondsbury Parish Council
330561	Andy Perkins - South Gloucestershire Labour Group	1060929	Claire Dolman - Hanham Abbots Parish Council
335553	Kate Tinsley - Peacock & Smith - Wm. Morrison Supermarkets Plc	1060961	Fiona Thornton - Westerleigh Parish Council
347713	Simon Fitton - RPS - Crest	1061057	D Bailey - Pucklechurch Parish Council
383105	Sian Parry - Avon Wildlife Trust	1061089	Leigh-Ann Jefferies - Siston Parish Council
387265	David Primrose - South Gloucestershire Corporate Equalities Forum	1062465	Michael Thomas - Bitton Parish Council
388161	Stephen Staines - Friends, Families & Travellers	1064609	Julian Clements - St. Paul's Catholic Primary School
399617	Dodington Parish Council	1085185	Kevin Hamblin - Filton College
411169	Sue Hope - South Gloucestershire Council Ward Councillor	1085697	Ruth Davis - South Gloucestershire Liberal Democrat Group
417633	Alex Wilson - Fulfords Land & Planning Services	1121217	Di Aldrich
463233	Victoria Hicks - Oldland Parish Council	1171681	Fred Andress - Planning Issues Limited - Churchill Retirement Living Ltd
702337	Tim Baker - Strategic Land Partnerships	1173089	Rachael Wright
803489	Rose Freeman - The Theatres Trust	1174529	Christopher Dawson - Knightstone Housing Association
803681	Sharon Robbins - Bitton Parish Council	1185185	Peter Bruce - Watley's End Residents Society
803873	Peter Tyzack - South Gloucestershire Council Ward Councillor	1215297	Roger Allen
805601	Richard Bull - Environment Agency	1224449	J Howard
805665	Jamie Sullivan - Tetlow King Planning - RP Planning Consortium	1242977	Paul Hatcher
838593	Malcolm Watt - Cotswolds Conservation Board (AONB)	1282337	Anne Parker
893761	Alison McIver	1288993	Donna Damzelle
905409	Jamie Sullivan - Tetlow King Planning - Mr John Hollister et al	1289441	Justin Hayward
916289	Claire Young - South Gloucestershire Council Ward Councillor	1297601	Martin Richardson
936417	Julie Clay - Yate Town Council	1307297	Susan Quinn
1032545	Frank Rogers	1330593	Andrew Smith
1036545	Quentin Killey	1348257	Michael Garrett
1039649	Patricia Burge	1377121	Annette.dixon
1039777	Pauline Wilson - The Wildlife Trust	1383873	Rob and Caroline Marshall
1051777	Tim Fairhead	1389217	Elizabeth Dyer - Yate Reading Group
1052193	Emma Creasey	1397185	Diana Cave
1054305	Alan Pinder - Friends of the Earth	1400641	Chris Ashton - AW Land Limited
1060321	Dawn Bramley - Falfield Parish Council	1404577	Alan Glass
1060481	Nikki Carter - Doynton Parish Council	1404897	Richard Lloyd
1060545	Jacqueline Gregory - Mangotsfield	1405217	Dean Lanfear
		1410849	Amanda Grundy - Natural England
		1412577	Shaun Denny - Cemex UK Operation Ltd

## Appendix 1

<b>ID</b>	<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>ID</b>	<b>Respondent Name</b>
1422913	Benn Davis		Green Belt Campaign
1427169	Margaret Pinder	2816449	R Pyle
1429857	Lucy Hamid - Patchway Town Council	2819553	C Hall
1442945	C Jackson - D2 Planning Limited	2819585	Mr Paul Wildgoose - Thornbury Society for Archaeology & Local History
1534017	Chris Hays - White Young Green		
1676513	Iain Dunnett		
1679937	Gillian Otlet	2819809	R Brady
1803521	Natalie Field - NHS South Gloucestershire	2819841	Mr David Fear - Fearson Homes
		2820449	Mr Graham Lanfear
1944417	Rob Collis	2822017	Mr & Mrs Doug & Dianne Heal
1978465	Jack Howland-Harris	2826401	Adrian & Lynne Smithson
1980033	Anthony Mitchell	2827745	Steve Webb MP
1994081	Robert Dale - Sustainable Thornbury	2827777	Marilyn Palmer - Campaign to Protect Rural England AVONSIDE
1995713	Robert Brittliff		
2009793	Richard Paul Hobbs	2832353	Ms B Berridge
2039201	Andrew Gillingham	2834433	Mrs J Davies
2040513	Andrew Jeffryes	2839649	Mr & Mrs P King
2048193	S Templeman	2840065	Mr & Mrs Peter & Ann Windram
2254753	Roy & Jan Murley - Friends of Ridge Wood	2840737	Ms C Locke
		2842465	Mr & Mrs DJ & PW Moore
2491041	John Moore	2848609	Mr & Mrs Colin & Jean Eastwood
2604321	Camilla Yerbury - RPS Group - Avon and Somerset Constabulary	2855425	Jessica Potter - South West Regional Development Agency
2604577	Justin Milward - Woodland Trust	2857057	A D England
2627777	Amanda Osborne	2857377	Mr Nigel Bray - Railfuture
2687841	Adrian Kerton	2857889	G Harford
2747041	Anthony Brown	2861633	Michael Shebson - Ariva Ltd (Severnside Distribution)
2793153	Alison Davis-Evans		
2794305	Dave Davis-Evans	2879809	Jeff Rawlinson - Pilning & Severn Beach Parish Council
2796641	Rachael Bust - The Coal Authority		
2797889	Barry Turner - Oldbury-on-Severn Parish Council	2880449	Bob Sellwood - Sellwood Planning
		2880609	Christopher Rose - CSJ Planning Consultants Ltd
2798689	David Crook - Government Office for the South West		
2798945	Emma Woodhouse - National Farmers Union	2880641	Craig Noel - Strutt & Parker - LLP Planning & Development
2799105	G Parsons - Sport England (South West)	2880673	David Lander - Boyer Planning Ltd
		2880929	Marcus Plaw - Colliers CRE
2799265	Graham Parker - PJ Planning	2881121	Rob Duff - Pegasus Planning
2800961	Patrick Williams	2881249	Simon Prescott - Barton Wilmore
2801473	Mr Ray Newbiggin - Joint Local Access Forum	2909537	Lyn Iles - Winterbourne Parish Council
2801825	Mr Robert Spence - Forestry Commission	2947681	Eric Briggs - Rangeworthy & Bagstone Neighbourhood Watch
2803041	J Ashman - Highways Agency	2949345	Ann Jones
2803745	C Power - English Heritage	3012833	Hazel Jones - Hawkesbury Parish Council
2803777	Cathy Francis - King Sturge - North Bristol NHS	3045985	Brian Lovell - Cold Ashton Parish Council
2804033	Jane Hennell - British Waterways	3057569	Nicola Little - Hanham Parish Council
2804449	Ms Tessa Coombes - GWE Business West	3058273	Derek Quilter
		3061153	Glynn and Elizabeth Griffiths
2804897	Wiltshire	3113185	Felicity Hudd - Wick & Abson Parish Council
2807489	D Ogborne - Wessex Water		
2807553	Dave Redgewell - South West Transport Network	3145601	Keith Annis - Redrow
		3148257	Mark Fox - Pegasus Planning Group LLP
2810049	Jennifer Harmer - South Gloucestershire Disability Action Forum	3190177	Tim Pyper - Aust Parish Council
		3196129	Kieran Warren - Frampton Cotterell Parish Council
2813537	Ron & Joan Morton - Shortwood		

## Appendix 1

<b>ID</b>	<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>ID</b>	<b>Respondent Name</b>
3212609	M M Wise	3916225	Sylvia King
3232641	Sharon Petela - Bradley Stoke Town Council	3916641	B C Gilroy
3232737	Gill Brooks - Tytherington Parish Council	3916705	Richard Small - CEMEX UK Operations Limited
3239361	Paul Tregear	3917313	P E Dykes
3245505	Jeff Richards - WYG Planning & Design	3918721	Sally Hall
3248353	Anthony Sarafian	3918753	B Pearce
3254369	Richard and Michelle Green	3918849	C Platt
3260897	Paula Stratford - Blue Sky Planning	3918945	Gill Leaper
3342561	Barrass	3919041	Richard Cross
3354113	I Jewson - Ian Jewson Planning Ltd	3919137	Patricia A Brittliff
3549729	Peter Marshall	3919201	Bob Hewitt
3549793	Charles Eardley-Wilmot - Concern for Thornbury	3919329	Robert W Chilcraft
3550273	K Parr	3919361	Lucy Fitzpatrick
3553793	Adam Pratt - Terrace Hill	3919425	Clive Washbourne
3557665	Peter Roberts - Barton Willmore	3919905	Jake Eady
3557729	Julia Ford	3920001	Susan Rogers
3597377	Sue Rowley	3920033	B R Ginn
3643521	L Kay	3920129	John Amor
3664705	Dave Rowley	3920161	Pearce
3706657	Matthew Seaman - Origin3 - S J Cook	3920225	R G Bennett
3707457	Thomas Jenner-Fust - Hill Parish Meeting	3920257	Victoria Stone
3707809	John Sneddon - Tetlow King Planning	3920289	Marlene Inward
3713601	Julie Reed	3920321	Ken Larkins
3724225	Anthony Domaille	3920385	B N Inward
3756673	Aurella Edwards	3920545	M Lewis
3756769	Helen Sydenham	3920609	Paul Horsfall and Claire Garai
3763201	Gerrit-Jan Rollema	3920993	Robert Goodman
3763393	Jennie Bennett	3921217	Benedict Paul O'Donohoe
3768961	Suzanne Stewart	3921537	H Edwards
3780065	Rob Hudson	3921857	J Edwards
3784801	Grace Davies - Save Thornbury's Green Heritage	3921953	Dr R S Hall and Mrs F M Hall
3788481	Karl Scholz - Alder King	3922017	T Hemming
3790273	Christine Rickard	3922081	W & M Meacham
3802913	Rosemary Ashley	3923393	M E Jones
3848577	Zoey White	3923425	Susan Williams
3852801	Gillian Firth	3923457	M Calladine
3855041	Derek Campbell	3923489	Audrey Green
3861217	Colin Thorne	3923521	Lambert
3870657	Robert Hirstwood	3923553	E M Forsythe
3872065	Margaret Ruth Piolle	3923585	Sheila Forsythe
3872257	Norman Wright	3923617	R Jenkins
3898401	K Cole	3923649	Angela J Parnham
3900897	Rosemary Rodliffe	3923681	Michael John
3903265	Noel Wheatley	3923745	Margaret and David Jones
3903329	Peter Withers	3923777	Sally Osborne
3903425	Charles Hiscock	3923873	Trevor Edgeworth
3903937	Peter Bruce - Low Impact Development Group (Bristol & SW)	3923905	B Hulbert
3904609	James & Gabrielle Sumner	3923937	C Hulbert
3905601	Trevor Grover	3923969	Mr & Mrs Stocks
3906497	Janet Hellen	3924001	G Denning
3912289	Malcolm Biggs	3924033	A Smith
3913217	Ruth Diggle - NLP - PRUPIM Ltd	3924065	James Ashley
		3924097	David Ramsay
		3924129	Sam Ashley
		3924161	Steve Pople
		3924193	Muriel Hedges
		3924225	Simon Ashley
		3924257	J Jones

## Appendix 1

<b>ID</b>	<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>ID</b>	<b>Respondent Name</b>
3924289	Kim Hedges	3970817	Tim Pyper
3924321	Susan King	3970849	Colin Burnett - Burnett Planning & Development Ltd - Tesco Stores Ltd
3925441	Gareth Davies		E R and L J Wrighton
3925569	Tony Albon-Crouch - Marshfield Parish Council	3970977	Geoff and Maureen Hacon
		3971041	Bryan Smith - The Bristol Port Company
3925857	Paul and Rosalind Davies	3971073	I Stanley
3927009	Nigel Quarrell		Colin and Jasmine Williams
3927233	Kris Kinsey	3971169	Bridget Dunnett
3945281	Adam Neil - New Earth Solutions	3971201	Pam Franklin
3945313	Sarah Thompson	3971265	B J Osborne
3945409	Nigel Cant - Nigel Cant Planning	3971329	S Lane
3945665	Lance Johnson	3971425	Emma and Alan Daniells
3956609	Peter Dryell	3971521	Joyce Wilson
3957249	Andrew Turrell	3971617	Christina Biggs - Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways
3957313	Juliet Turrell	3971713	Beverley Hall and Dave Britt
3957409	A Gould	3971905	Adrian Clarkson
3957441	F Herod		John Rushforth - University of the West of England
3957601	G Herod	3971937	Faye McCormack
3957665	J Crates	3972065	Peter Collings
3957729	D Tucker	3972129	Rosemary Dan
3957825	Beryl Hall		Darren Green
3957857	Dorothy Ayton	3972321	V J and B Heathfield
3957889	Emma Colwill	3972353	Kendall Family
3958529	Jean Ferguson	3972417	Simon and Becky Luxton
3958561	A Harrison	3972449	Michael Orr - CSJ Planning Consultants
3958625	Caroline Jones	3972769	Mike Maggs
3958689	Richard Wilcox	3972833	Linda May
3958785	A Sedgman	3972865	Penny Skinner
3958849	B Hobbs	3972897	Ann Gibbs
3958945	Vivien Reynolds		N Purssord
3958977	Anthony Holliday	3972929	Mervyn Darville
3959041	Ben Stansfield - Cory Environmental (Gloucestershire) Ltd	3972961	Mike Whitehead
		3973409	Adrian & Madeline Mitchell
3959105	John Reynolds	3973665	Ronald Hayhurst
3959137	Roger Joint	3973697	Heidi Rosser
3959521	V Mutlow	3973729	Jenny Raggett - Campaign for Better Transport Bristol and Bath Travel To Work...
3959585	A Jones	3973761	Gillian Dunkley
3959617	Barbara McNamara	3973857	Jonathan Godfrey
3959649	M Garrity	3973889	Malcolm Ratcliff - Mineral Products Association
3959681	Pam Stone	3973921	Janet Charlton
3959745	Ros Plenty	3973953	Rex Sackett
3960513	Julie Mitchell		J.D. Hutchinson
3961185	Michael Camm - Hanham District Green Belt Conservation Society	3974529	S C Burton
		3974593	Nigel Clark - Baker Associates
3961313	Robert Sheehan	3974881	H Christopher
3961345	Georgina Eveline Mary Sheehan		D J Orton
3961441	Chris Phillips	3974945	Dave Franklin
3961473	Sarah Norton	3975169	P J Foster
3961633	terry Ray	3976385	Anna Johnston
3961729	Ian Crawford - Transport for Greater Bristol Alliance	3976545	Nick Johnston
		3976737	J E Powell
3966337	Barbara Goom - Thornbury United Reformed Church	3976865	
		3977281	
3966529	Tim Noden - Harrow Estates plc	3977313	
3967169	Matthew Shellum - McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd.	3977473	
		3978209	
3967425	C Erlebach	3978241	
3968257	David Martin	3978305	
3968641	Darren Nation		

## Appendix 1

<b>ID</b>	<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>ID</b>	<b>Respondent Name</b>
3978529	Alan Aldous	3989697	G Blyth
3978657	Steven O'Callaghan	3989729	Gordon Thomas
3978913	Pat Cotterell	3989889	Karen and Gerald Porter
3979073	Karen & Peter Napthine	3990529	Richard Durnford
3979137	S Pilgrim	3990561	G and M Bostic
3979233	Reg Illingworth - Shepperdine Against Nuclear Energy	3990593	Marlene Pettit
3979777	Chris Fenner - The CJF Partnership	3990625	R Edwards
3979969	C Pilgrim	3990657	Philip Edwards
3980385	Andrew Turner	3990689	Marjorie Adams
3982305	F and S Moxom	3990945	Reginald James Adams
3982657	Jane Harper	3991009	Pamela Campbell
3982721	N Burd	3991041	Thomas Beech
3982849	Paul Brown	3991073	Iris Biefang Frisancho
3982913	C Eardley-Wilmot	3991105	Harold Bell
3982945	Mr & Mrs Townsend	3991169	Miriam Barnes
3982977	Derek and Dorothy Jay	3991233	Les Huke
3983009	Karen and Ian Mullan	3991297	David Lewis
3983041	Linda Burgess	3991361	Nigel Green
3983073	Colleen Paviour	3991425	Louise Brown
3983553	Jeremy Ainsley	3991489	Michael Lock
3983713	G Griffin	3991521	K W Clark
3983745	Sylvia Fox	3991553	Baxter
3984545	Brenda and David Rees	3991617	Hannah Cook
3984641	Mary Jennings	3991649	Graeme Cook
3984673	Thomas Lloyd	3992385	Colette Cook
3984705	T A Sellers	3992417	Judith Case
3984737	T D Conolly	3992449	Kim Ainscough
3984801	L Edwards	3992481	Gillian Hancock
3984833	L E Addison	3992513	Peter T H Hatton
3984929	Ernest Burgess	3992577	Mrs Alison Hudson and Mr S Panting
3984993	S J Bryant	3992609	Wayne Preece
3985025	Brian Rowe	3992641	Jayne Mary Hobbs
3985057	M M Rowe	3992673	Marlene Lanfear
3985089	Neil Roberts	3992737	G Price
3985121	Carlyle	3992769	Christine Harris
3985185	Paul Craig	3992897	Mrs Hall
3985217	Alexandra Craig	3992961	David Harris
3985249	W J Pearce	3992993	Malcolm Lynden
3985281	Matt Scarbrough	3993057	Paul and Sonya Harvey
3985537	Elizabeth Major	3993089	Mr & Mrs Weidekamp
3985601	S U Dally	3993121	Ms Alison Harding and Mr A Millington
3985633	Philip Dally	3993185	David and Anne Ridge
3985665	V C and C F Robertson	3993249	Steven Wright
3985729	Trevor Hellen	3993281	John Osborne
3985761	John and Meg Moseley	3993345	Iole Crociani
3987649	John Poole	3993505	A Whiteway
3987681	J Porter	3993537	Alison Ruth Griffiths
3988289	Rosie Farquhar - Terence O'Rourke - BAE Systems	3993569	Amanda Aldridge
3988641	Nigel Coles	3993729	B J Jones
3988673	Stephen Wells	3993793	Valerie Vizard
3988705	M Lazenbury	3993825	W Laird
3988897	J Perkins	3993857	Pamela Davidson
3988929	Angela Wells	3993889	M Southgate
3988961	Elizabeth J Smith	3993985	Peter Owen
3988993	Mary Armour	3994241	J Owen
3989057	John Beaven	3994849	S J Tollerton
3989537	Jean Beaven	3994881	Mary and John Ackland
		3995073	Thomas Wheeler

## Appendix 1

<b>ID</b>	<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>ID</b>	<b>Respondent Name</b>
3995105	Samantha Nelmes	4005217	S G James
3995137	Jazzmine Nelmes	4005249	Naomi Verlaque
3995233	Phyllis Brenda Richards	4005313	Lynne Vincent
3995265	Len Jacobs	4005377	Robin Irish
3999009	Angela Jacobs	4005409	M Stapleton
3999105	Brian Butler	4005441	G R Jeffery
3999201	Sheila Eardley-Wilmot	4005473	Judy Lloyd
3999361	Nicola Kennedy	4005505	Caroline Poole
3999393	Ellen Morgan	4005537	B Godsman and A Boswell
3999521	Chris White-Horne	4005569	N Nagle - Little Sodbury Parish Meeting
3999585	Linda Burkill		
3999649	Mabel Choularton	4005601	P J Budd
3999745	Kate Morgan	4005633	Kate Williams
3999777	Stephen Morgan	4005665	Wendy Priday
3999809	G H Morgan	4005697	Gary Priday
3999873	A R James	4005857	Ana Tsoucalas
3999969	Catherine White-Horne	4005889	J Densley
4000001	J Ebbs	4005921	Jane Smart - Tormarton Parish Council
4000033	Wendy Vercoe		
4000129	Priscilla Perrin	4005985	Barbara Ward
4000161	V J Hones	4006017	Jemma Leach
4000193	George Ford	4006049	C J Oakey
4000257	F R Ebbs	4006081	Cynthia Hopwood
4000289	D Howard	4006113	Alan and Teresa Dunn
4000353	Claire Howard	4006145	Tony Morgan
4000385	Mr & Mrs Duke	4006177	Sarah Parker
4000417	Awbrey J R Hudson	4006209	J C Whiting
4000449	Paul and Ann Dack	4006241	Sally Evans
4000545	John and Jo Wilson	4006273	Anne Kirby
4000577	The Wilmer Family	4006305	Charlotte Gillingham
4000641	Mr & Mrs Jeffries	4006337	Cathy & David Peacock
4000705	Mr & Mrs Williams	4006369	Allison & Nick Googh
4000801	W and J Reynolds	4006401	Helen Kirby
4000833	S Davies	4006465	Anonymous .
4002721	L McNally	4006529	Maurice Carter
4002785	D Nicholson	4006561	F Joswiak
4002881	R W Gorham	4006593	A F Jones
4002977	S Gorham	4006625	S M Saunders
4003169	P King	4006657	Rowan McKibbin
4003201	Helen Palmer	4006721	J V Andrews
4003233	Rachel Robinson - WYG Planning & Design - Sainsbury's Supermarkets...	4006753	P Moore
4003265	Sara Cant	4006849	E Kingscott
4003361	Martyn Stutchbury - Scott Brownrigg - Goodman	4006881	Trudi Irish
4003393	Nicholas Reed	4006913	Bernard Mardon
4004321	Adrian and Lynsey Clarke	4006977	E Smith
4004353	Emma Rickard	4007009	Clare Mardon
4004385	Christopher Rickard	4007041	Graham Corpe
4004417	Joanna Rickard	4007073	Carole Corpe
4004545	Ben Lovell	4007105	Steven Hatcher
4004577	Jackie Brightwell	4007169	Janet Hudson
4004641	Jean Watson	4007201	Tony Stagg
4004705	M Oliver	4007233	E A Clark
4004865	L Oliver	4007265	George Irish
4004961	A Gilligan	4007329	David Reynolds
4005089	Nick Fenning	4007361	Caitlin Stewart
4005121	Cathryn Mills	4007393	Sara Anderson Jones
4005153	D Wallis	4007425	Shanice Walton
		4008641	Ben Sellick
		4008673	D A Taylor

## Appendix 1

<b>ID</b>	<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>ID</b>	<b>Respondent Name</b>
4008705	Elizabeth Hudson	4021377	G M Bennett
4008769	R Escott	4022241	Ian Beckey - Living Easton
4008801	N Carpenter	4022337	Brian Lomas - Light Rail Transit Association
4008833	Paul Aldridge	4022369	James Bryant
4008865	Lynn Sullivan	4022721	A T Andrews
4008897	C Golding	4022849	R Preedy
4008929	J Golding	4023521	G S White
4008961	Carol Williams	4023649	P J Cranke
4008993	T Williams	4024353	Christina Lewis
4009025	Gilbert W. Robson	4024481	Paula Stratford - LaSalle Investment Management
4009057	V A Robson	4024833	Cathie Nicholson
4009121	David Perry	4024897	Lynfa Fisher
4009185	M Perry	4024961	Sharron Savery
4009249	J Allen	4025633	K W & M Webber
4009313	M Wood	4025729	Pippa Davey
4009345	T J Wood	4025921	J Outram
4009377	James Reynolds	4025953	R Hodge
4009505	Kay Gillingham	4026081	Douglas Richards
4009569	Elaine Brady	4026241	Chris Everett
4009633	Stephen Stewart	4026465	Martin Leay - Badminton Estate
4009665	Alison Hatcher	4027073	Kathryn Strode
4009697	A C Taylor	4027169	Derek Lewis
4009729	Ann Martin	4029217	Tim Gent - GVA Grimley - F & C Reit Asset Management
4009761	Mervyn and Nora Russell	4029569	Chris Haworth - Bristol Property Agents Association
4009825	a senior citizen	4029825	Chris Haworth - Alder King
4009857	Doug Foote	4030017	Douglas Symes - Tortwoth Estate Company
4010273	Elaine Foote	4030273	Christine McNulty - Planning Issues
4010305	Philip Halsall	4030337	Tim Roberts - Mrs Vivia Bamford
4010369	Kath Davidson	4030369	Craig Noel - Airbus Operations Ltd
4010433	Jean Harcourt	4030433	Kevin Hunt - Cribbs Lodge Hotel
4010465	Ian and Sandra Stevens	4032065	Peter Stacey - Turley Associates - Persimmon & Ashfield
4010497	Clinton Hull	4035553	Bob Hall
4010529	Robert and Rhian Blade	4037313	Anne Upton - Save Oldland Common Green Spaces
4010561	Thomas Hulbert	4038145	Dominic Lawson - Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning Ltd
4010753	Ken Parish	4042241	Judith Jones
4010849	Gerald Anthony Longden	4042273	Kevin Nicholls
4011649	Robert J S Hudson	4043553	Andrew Spencer
4012417	Jacqueline Mulliner - Strategic Land Partnerships	4043649	Jane Fox
4012545	Clare Spearman - Mr Anthony Crocker	4043681	Joan Porter
4012737	Jeff Richards - Bloor Homes (South West) Ltd	4043745	Mike Graham
4012865	Jacqueline Mulliner - Bloor Homes and Barratt Developments Plc	4043809	Deb Young
4012929	Simon Prescott - Bovis Homes	4043873	Kerr Brown
4012993	Mark Fox - Maximus Developments	4044033	Andrew Denning
4019073	M J Quinton - Hoddell Ass. - Mr B F Taylor	4044065	John & Ann Lumber
4019105	Mr & Mrs Dando	4044097	Ross Phillips
4019201	K T Wills	4044129	A Fraser
4019233	Sue Sage	4044193	Mr & Mrs Elston
4019265	M J Quinton - Hoddell Ass. - WCR Investments	4044353	Des Dunlop - D2 Planning Ltd
4019489	Andrew Penna - Dr Brian McConnell	4044993	J Jackson
4020257	John Baker - Strategic Land Partnerships	4045153	Stuart Hill - Castle School Governors
4020481	Ian Mellor - Terramond Ltd	4046401	Jonathan Adams - Tetlow King
4021313	J W Bennett		



## Appendix 1

ID	Respondent Name	ID	Respondent Name
	Planning Ltd - McBraida	4049153	Heather Johnson
4046529	Louisa Bowden	4049185	Mrs Davis
4046625	Stuart Bowden	4049217	Gill Cox
4046657	Richard Pepler	4049249	Rich Savery
4046689	Stephan Dack	4049281	J Baggs
4046721	Amy Bowers	4049313	May Forster
4046753	Sally De La Torre	4049345	Zosia Young
4046785	E Weaver	4049377	Thomas Leo Connolly
4046817	Giles Vincent	4049441	Barbara Litten
4046849	Sylvia Vincent	4049473	B Wood
4046881	Philip Burgess	4049505	A Wallis
4046913	Justine Thomas	4049537	J Cole
4046977	Mike Speake	4049569	A F Coles
4047009	M Stapleton	4049601	H T Barton
4047585	Anne Dolden	4049633	Claire Mansfield
4047617	Valerie Glassenbury	4049665	Anna Peters
4047649	Owen Lewis	4049697	Mr & Mrs Medd
4047681	Sara Watershouse	4049729	Maureen Connolly
4047713	Carol Wilkinson	4049761	M Eardley
4047745	David Paviour	4049793	Mary Lloyd
4047777	Anthea Nener	4049825	Annette Wells
4047809	Russell Weller	4049857	Heather Hasell
4047873	Tanya Weller	4049889	Rachel Taylor
4047905	Emma Dutfield	4050113	D Bull
4047937	Anne Casey	4050145	E J Miles
4047969	N Geal	4050177	Alison Brown
4048033	Anita Miles	4050241	Linda Walcroft
4048097	Ann Bull	4050273	Susan Shaw
4048129	Lynette Loughran	4050305	Gerald Clarke
4048161	Martin Poole	4050337	Janet Beaty
4048193	Jen Gash	4050369	Maggie Jeffery
4048225	Fiona Pollard	4050401	K Wyres
4048257	George Collett	4050433	Simon Lewis
4048289	R B Hill	4050465	S A Lewis
4048321	Elizabeth Hill	4050497	Steve Wyres
4048353	Mary Sargent	4050529	Ye Huang
4048417	Jonathan Bailey	4050561	Rod Smyth
4048449	EF Boucher	4050593	Norman Taylor
4048481	HTC Boucher	4050625	M J Hennessy
4048513	Suzanne Brown	4050657	Danny waters
4048545	Brian Brown	4050689	Neil Stone
4048577	Norman Templeman	4050721	Jane Marks
4048641	Pamela M Sargent	4050753	Brian Proctor
4048673	D W Savage	4050785	Julie Watson
4048705	Lauren Rebecca Penfold	4050817	Jane Anderson Jones
4048737	Barbara Outram	4050849	F E Gerrish
4048769	J Gill	4050913	Joan Max
4048801	Russell Cant	4050945	Wayne Garrick
4048833	Trevor Hill	4051041	Kate McMenamin
4048865	John Clarke	4051073	Connor Stewart
4048897	John Lamb	4051105	Karl Traynor
4048929	E M Hodge	4051137	Cathy Traynor
4048961	Geoff Jones	4051169	Eileen Mills
4048993	Mrs Kathryn Carpenter and David E Carpenter	4051201	John Mills
4049025	Keith Milward	4051233	Pauline Shepherd
4049057	Josephine Press	4051265	M J Quinton - Hoddell Ass. - Downend Estates Ltd
4049089	A Mugliston	4051297	D Stafford
4049121	John Crawley	4051329	S E Lelley

## Appendix 1

ID	Respondent Name	ID	Respondent Name
4051393	Gordon Hughes	4054209	R B Whittaker
4051457	C Jane Nunn	4054241	Sharon Penfold
4051553	M J Quinton - Hoddell Ass. - Wickwar Trading Estate	4054273	Rob Penfold
4051585	Robin Lines	4054337	D K Thomas
4051617	Dorothy Watts	4054433	J Ratcliffe
4051649	Bethany Tucker - National Grid	4054465	Pat Cadman
4051713	Peter and Jo Eickhoff	4054497	Alan & Mair French
4051809	John W Miles	4054529	Paul Gallagher
4051873	D Ford	4054593	Alun Howells
4051905	Joan E Meadowcroft	4054625	B Quinion
4051937	Graham Barley	4054753	E & L Drewett
4051969	Diane Barnard	4054817	Kevin Sharp
4052001	Doreen Barley	4054849	Gary & Deborah Curtis
4052033	Les Craig	4054881	Mike Clarke
4052065	D G Ward	4054913	Amanda Barrass
4052097	D Jones	4055425	Peter & Kay Everton
4052129	Bethan Lewis	4055457	Rosemary Burton
4052161	Trefor Lewis	4055489	Savills - Dominion Corporate Trustees
4052193	Stephen Hyndham	4055617	Tim Roberts - Horizon Nuclear Power
4052225	Andrew Keates	4057665	Paul Murray
4052257	John Leonard Bennett	4058017	Lesley Metcalf - Sovereign Housing Group
4052289	Carla Watson	4058049	Tim Roberts - Atherton Family Trust
4052321	Mary Scott	4058849	Hilary Lewis
4052353	David Beattie	4058945	J E Trott
4052385	Debbie Ash	4059009	Sarah Stagg
4052417	Paul Marks	4059073	Marjorie Bailey
4052449	Heather Palmer	4059425	G M Whittaker
4052673	M J Quinton - Hoddell Ass. - Engine Common Trustees	4059585	Eric Homer - Central Networks
4052705	M Handford	4059681	S Doherty - Civil Aviation Authority
4052737	Annis Clarke	4059873	Cynthia Sutton
4052769	Robert L Rawlings	4060993	Ian Bennell
4052801	June Victoria Harvey	4061601	Michael .
4052833	Naomi Smyth	4143969	Cathy Francis - King Sturge - Eastwood Park
4052865	Angela Cranke	4144033	Jamie Sullivan - Tetlow King - Harvey Shopfitters
4052897	S Cranke	4144065	Jonathan Adams - Tetlow King - Fishpool Hill
4052929	R Collis	4144129	Jonathan Adams - Tetlow King - Logersham Developments
4052961	Stephen Andrews	4144385	Simon Fitton - RPS - Strategic Land Partnerships
4052993	Sophie Kilmartin	4144417	Matthew Seaman - Origin3 - Engineering & Allied Holdings
4053185	M Windeatt	4144449	Peter Stacey - Turley Associates - Taylor Wimpey
4053217	Sarah Roberts & Stefan Jaglin		
4053249	Alun Owen		
4053281	John Price		
4053345	Alan Trevelyn Jones		
4053377	S J Gilliard		
4053441	E L Lazenbury		
4053473	Nicola Bottrell		
4053665	David Bishop - Bristol City Council		
4053697	Peter Bruce		
4053761	Paul Kentish - Paul Kentish & Co and RPS		
4053953	Rosemary Williams		
4053985	C Ashforth		
4054017	Allan Williams		
4054049	Elizabeth Babb		
4054081	Roy Pearson		
4054113	Mike & Margaret Hems		
4054145	Jean West		

