

South Gloucestershire Core Strategy



Addendum to Regulation 30(1)(e) Statement

April 2012

Contents

		Page
1.	Introduction	1
2.	Representations received	2
3.	Main Issues raised	4
	<i>Chapters 1 - 10</i>	4
	<i>Chapters 12 - 18</i>	23
	<i>Chapter 19, Glossary, Appendices</i>	34
	<i>Proposals Map</i>	37
	<i>General/Other Issues</i>	38
	<i>Sustainability Appraisal</i>	39
	<i>Evidence Base</i>	40
Appendix 1	List of Respondents	41
Appendix 2	Post-Submission Engagement Statement	Separate document (SD12/3)
Appendix 3	December 2011 Core Strategy Engagement Statement	Separate document (SD12/4)

1. Introduction

1.1 The Regulation 30(1)(e) Statement (SD11) was produced for the consultation and engagement undertaken in late Spring 2010 on the Pre-Submission Publication Draft Core Strategy. The purpose of this Addendum is to:

- a) set out the number of representations received to the three engagement activities that have been undertaken on the Core Strategy since then; and
- b) provide a summary of the main issues raised in these representations.

NB The Addendum does not contain a full record of all the issues raised by the representations nor does it contain the representations in detail. Copies of all the representations received have been forwarded to the Inspector conducting the Core Strategy Examination.

1.2 The three engagement activities covered by this Addendum are:

- 1) Proposed Changes to the Pre-Submission Core Strategy, December 2010;
- 2) Further Proposed Changes to the Pre-Submission Core Strategy, March 2011; and
- 3) December 2011 Core Strategy (incorporating Post-Submission Changes).

1.3 Details of the activities undertaken on these three engagements are set out in three different statements. – Appendix 2 to the Regulation (1)(e) Statement (SD11/2), Post-Submission Engagement Statement (SD12/3) and December 2011 Core Strategy Engagement Statement (SD12/4). These two latter statements are Appendices 2 and 3 to this Addendum, but are bound separately and can be accessed from www.southglos.gov.uk/corestrategy

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

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

*Chapters 12 – 18 Spatial area policies

Glossary, Proposals Map and General/other issues

Sustainability Appraisal and Evidence Base

*No representations were received to Chapter 11

2. Representations received

2.1 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.

Proposed Changes – December 2010

2.2 The Council received 436 representations to the consultation on the Proposed Changes from 118 different people and organisations. The majority received were from agents and/or developers and the general public, mainly residents of Thornbury. The remaining representations were from statutory consultees, interest/environment groups, Local Members and Town and Parish Councils.

2.3 Of the representations received, 305 were to the Proposed Changes, 5 commented on the Proposals Maps, and 4 commented on the Sustainability Appraisal. The remaining representations either reiterated or amplified existing objections (i.e. objections to the Pre-Submission Core Strategy) or made new representations to the Core Strategy unrelated to the Proposed Changes.

Objections	373
Support	62
No Comment	1
TOTAL	436

Further Proposed Changes – March 2011

2.4 The Council received 18 representations to the consultation on the Further Proposed Changes from 9 organisations, mainly from planning agents. Again, of these representations, 8 were to the Further Proposed Changes while the others either related to the Proposed Changes or to other parts of the Core Strategy.

Objections	14
Support	0
No Comment	4
TOTAL	18

December 2011 Core Strategy

2.5 737 representations were received by the Council to the December 2011 Core Strategy (incorporating Post-Submission Changes) from 356 individuals and organisations. Over 60% of the representations received were from the general public and 20% were from agents and developers/landowners. The remaining representations were from statutory consultees, interest/environment groups, Local Members and Town and Parish Councils.

Objections	475
Support	256
No Comment	6
TOTAL	737

2.6 In addition two petitions were submitted by the Save Filton Airfield campaign group which have been treated as representations. One was an e-petition signed by 211 people and the other a paper petition signed by 3,443 people.

2.7 The lists of respondents to the 3 engagement activities is set out in Appendix 1. Schedules of all the responses (SD14, SD14/1 and SD14/2), including copies of the original representations, are available on the Council's website www.southglos.gov.uk/corestrategy.

3. Main issues raised

3.1 The following is a summary of the main issues that have been raised by the representations. Consequently, 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. Reference to the Further Proposed Changes is only shown where comments are applicable, due to small number of changes involved and representations received. The summary presents an issue in relation to the most appropriate part of the document and generally follows the order of the Core Strategy document.

3.2 A number of representations repeated objections which had already been made to one of the earlier engagement activities in this report or to the Pre-Submission Core Strategy. While these responses have been counted as representations received for tallying purposes, they have not generally been included in the summaries. This Addendum Report therefore needs to be read alongside the Regulation 30(1)(e) Report on the Pre-Submission Core Strategy (March 2011) (SD11) which can be accessed from www.southglos.gov.uk/corestrategy

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)

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
4	0	5	1

3.3 The representations were from a cross-section of interests and generally concerned points of clarification and procedural issues, including cross boundary working with adjacent local planning authorities, the new duty to cooperate and Neighbourhood Planning.

Chapter 2 – Setting the Scene

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
0	0	1	0

3.4 An agent objected to the undersupply of open market and affordable housing these past 10 years not being acknowledged.

Chapter 3 – Key issues

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
3	0	2	0

3.5 Comments were received concerning matters of clarification from a cross-section of interests. An agent considers para 3.8 implies that normal levels of growth occurred in South Gloucestershire prior to the economic downturn.

Chapter 4 – Vision, Strategic Objectives and Strategy for Development

a) Vision

3.6 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

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
0	0	2	0

3.7 Renewable UK suggest that the vision should include climate change mitigation, reference to the creation of a green economy and reference to security of electricity supply. The other objection relates to the strategy for development.

Vision for the North Fringe

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
1	2	0	0

3.8 One agent considers that the reference to green infrastructure is too detailed and, therefore, inappropriate for a vision. The Avon Wildlife Trust and NHS South Gloucestershire welcome the new sentences on green infrastructure.

Vision for the East Fringe

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
0	0	1	1

3.9 The objection is connected to the locational strategy for the East Fringe and the promotion of a development site in the Green Belt. Conversely, the support is connected with the development of Emersons Green.

Vision for Yate and Chipping Sodbury

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
4	1	0	0

3.10 The objections received concern the new neighbourhood to the north of Yate. The promoter of the site objects to only 2,400 of the 3,000 new homes coming forward by 2026, while Yate Town Council and Yate Liberal Democrats object to the overall scale of development. One agent objects to the words “locally generated housing requirements”.

Vision for Severnside

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
3	0	0	0

3.11 An agent objects to the revised vision as it is an example of the Council seeking to retro-fit policy in a manner which is not deliverable. The other objections relate to implementation matters.

Vision for the Rural Areas

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
0	0	1	9

3.12 One parish council considers that the vision is too restrictive. Support for the vision is mainly from members of the public and parish councils. This support is directly associated with the Core Strategy not identifying villages as the location for further housing development.

b) Strategic Objectives

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
4	1	0	4

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).

3.13 The objections and support have been received from a cross section of interests. The objections cover the following:

Responding to Climate Change and High Quality Design

- Promote the use of grey water systems

Tackling Congestion and Improving Accessibility

- Add new objective concerning specific proposals for the Yate corridor

Managing Environmental Resources and Built Heritage

- Add reference to ensuring the appropriate and viable re-use of heritage assets

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)

Proposed Changes		Further Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support
52	5	2	0	81	20

3.14 There is an amount of double counting in the objection numbers, as a significant proportion of objectors have commented each time the Strategy is referred to in different sections of the Core Strategy document.

3.15 The spatial breakdown of these comments is:

	Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
	Object	Support	Object	Support
Overall approach of the Strategy	25	4	40	3
North Fringe	14	1	14	2
East Fringe	1		3	2
Yate/Chipping Sodbury	7		12	1
Thornbury	2		1	3
Rural Areas	2		10	9
Sevenside	1		1	

3.16 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.

Overall Approach of the StrategyProposed Changes

- Housing figures are too high
- Housing figures are too low
- No evidence for the level of housing provision
- Probable that housing trajectory will not be achieved as no contingency provided for
- Premature to delete reference to RSS

- Adequate regard should be had to the evidence which informed the RSS in the absence of any other up to date locally derived evidence
- Need for formal review of Green Belt boundaries to support the Council's overall approach to development in the Green Belt.
- No justification for statement in Policy CS5 regarding extending the Green Belt
- Object to deletion of the reference in Policy CS5 to other changes to Green Belt boundaries where exceptional circumstances are demonstrated
- Unsound to base the district's 20 year plan on today's low levels of activity.

Further Proposed Changes

- Strategy does not recognise possibility of a new nuclear power station at Oldbury

December 2011 Core Strategy

- Premature to delete reference to RSS
- Strategy inconsistent with national planning policy
- Housing figures are too low to meet housing need or demand
- Term "up to... 2026 and beyond" is ambiguous and inconsistent with wording in Policy CS15
- Level of housing growth not supported by robust evidence
- Strategy should show how Council has complied with the 'duty to cooperate' and how the scale, distribution and delivery of development will be co-ordinated, particularly with the West of England authorities.
- Council should commit to early review of Core Strategy
- Detailed review of Green Belt needed
- Opposed to loss of Green Belt land
- Council's in principle objection to reducing the Green Belt is detrimental to planning strategically for the sub-region
- Green Belt strategy not supported by robust evidence
- Scope to extend Green Belt should be examined now not later
- Unclear whether reference to need to demonstrate 'exceptional circumstances' in Policy CS5 relates to removing further land from the Green Belt
- Object to releasing land from the Green Belt for residential development, particularly along the M32 corridor
- Current economic downturn should not be an excuse to avoid planning positively to meet historic shortfalls in housing supply
- Relying on existing commitments up to 2016 will not address housing undersupply since 2000/1
- First bullet of Policy CS5 should include delivery as well as planning of transport schemes
- Policy CS15 is inflexible – delete phasing bands
- Phasing demonstrates an inflexible approach and an inability to achieve sufficient levels of delivery during much of the plan period
- Inconsistencies in total columns in Policy CS15

Strategy for the North Fringe of Bristol urban area

Proposed Changes

- Land East of Harry Stoke should not be dependent on delivery of the Stoke Gifford Transport Link (SGTL)
- Council should set out fall back position in case the funding for the SGTL is not forthcoming

- Land to the west of the A4018 should be released from the Green Belt and identified as a reserve site
- 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

December 2011 Core Strategy

- Too much development being concentrated in the Cribbs/Patchway area – cumulative impacts, infrastructure and deliverability issues
- Housing figures should be revised down for Cribbs/Patchway New Neighbourhood
- Question delivery rates in the Cribbs/Patchway New Neighbourhood
- Inconsistency over the timing of the Cribbs/Patchway New Neighbourhood between Policy CS5, paras 4.11 and 4.12, Policy CS15 and para 12.7
- Phase Cribbs/Patchway New Neighbourhood so that brownfield sites are developed first
- Need to consider how different elements of the Cribbs/Patchway New Neighbourhood can stand alone to ensure short term delivery that contributes to meeting the longer term aims/objectives for the area.
- Exclude land retained as Green Belt west of A4018 within the Cribbs/Patchway New Neighbourhood from the Green Belt
- Timing of, and mechanism for, the deletion of land from Green Belt still unclear
- Reinstate commitment to safeguard Filton Airfield

Strategy for the East Fringe of Bristol urban area

December 2011 Core Strategy

- Following sites should be identified for development/new neighbourhood
 - land at Warmley, east Bristol
 - land east of A4175
 - land south of Shortwood
 - land at Mount Pleasant Farm, Longwell Green

Strategy for Yate & Chipping Sodbury

December 2011 Core Strategy

- Object to 3,000 houses
- 3,000 houses, rather than 2,400, should be allowed within the plan period
- Filton Airfield a more sustainable location for housing than north Yate
- No timeline for development at Yate in Policy CS5
- Land at Dyer's Lane/Mission Road, Engine Common should be allocated in place of/or as well as north Yate New Neighbourhood

Strategy for Thornbury

Proposed Changes

- Park Farm housing can be delivered sooner than identified in Policy CS15
- Insufficient housing identified for Thornbury

December 2011 Core Strategy

- Amend settlement boundary to allow short stay car park at Castle Street, Thornbury to come forward for development
- Opportunity to identify more than one site in Thornbury and deliver greater benefits to town

Strategy for the Rural AreasProposed Changes

- Reduced housing figures in Policy CS15 too low to sustain rural areas
- Policy CS5 will need to be amended following the enactment of the Localism Bill
- Include whole farm and estate plans in para 4.28

December 2011 Core Strategy

- 'Small scale' in para 4.27 is too imprecise. Include definition of 'settlement boundaries'
- Policies should be developed sooner rather than later – vision is weak
- Review of settlement boundaries should be undertaken now not in 5 years
- Council urgently need to review the role that the rural areas can play in delivering housing to meet the needs of rural residents
- Identify Frampton Cotterell/Coalpit Heath as settlement for further development
- Include land at Woodlands Farm, Frampton Cotterell for housing
- Council should also be identifying smaller sites that can be developed in the short term e.g. site at Engine Common, Yate
- There are a number of small sites on the edge of villages which could be released without compromising the Green Belt
- Strategy should allow for limited development in selected villages
- Identify large brownfield sites in rural areas as potential housing areas
- Exclude land at Iron Acton from Green Belt to allow expansion of WCS Environmental offices
- Overcourt Barns, Over Lane, Almondsbury should be removed from the Green Belt so as not to further constrain the site for Hydrock
- Settlement boundary review does not allow for innovative solutions to meet affordable housing need in these settlements
- Settlement boundary review does not make provision for Neighbourhood Plans to be brought forward which amend the settlement boundary
- Unclear in para 6.8 whether development should take place within the defined settlement boundary where one is defined

The following minor points were also made:

- Reference in para 10.10 to declining brownfield land now incorrect with Filton Airfield
- Query necessity for stating "...most recent Government legislation and guidance" in Policy CS5
- Delete "seek to ensure optimal benefits for the locality" from the first sentence of para 6.10a as it exceeds the tests in Circular 05/2005
- Major Infrastructure Planning Unit now referred to as the National Infrastructure Directorate (NID) within the Planning Inspectorate

Chapter 5 – High Quality Design and Responding to Climate Change

Policy CS1- High Quality Design

(including paragraphs 5.1- 5.18)

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
10	1	6	4

3.17 The majority of objections were made by developers, agents and interest groups. The main issue raised is that the requirement to achieve specific levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes is not justified either in Policy CS1 or in supporting paragraphs.

3.18 Other matters raised include:

- Viability should be an explicit consideration to be taken into account with recognition both in the policy and the supporting text
- Design priorities set out in paragraphs 5.7 – 5.14 are too detailed
- Requirement to achieve the 'highest possible standards of design' is ambiguous and represents a potentially onerous restriction on development
- Commit to producing an SPD in respect of Policy CS1 point 6

Policy CS2 – Green Infrastructure

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

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
4	1	3	2

3.19 The objections to the Proposed Changes concerned a drafting error, with the employment site of Hempton Court, Aztec West being shown as Green Infrastructure in Figure 5. This was corrected in the Further Proposed Changes.

3.20 The main issues raised are:

- Woodland Trust consider that the Policy and supporting text should contain a specific section on native woodland given the extensive raft of benefits it can deliver for green infrastructure across all the objectives listed in Policy CS2
- Clarify in paragraph 5.28 that the Green Infrastructure Network diagram may also identify areas which on detailed assessment should not form part of the network
- The Charlton Commoners identify Charlton Common as having been missed off Figure 1

Policy CS3 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation

(including paragraphs 5.35 - 5.43)

Proposed Changes		Further Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support
0	0	1	0	9	10

3.21 The majority of objections were received from parish councils and interest groups, including Rockhampton and Oldbury-on-Severn Parish Councils and Renewable UK.

3.22 The main issues raised are:

- Set out targets for renewable energy production, based on the totals suggested for former Avon, and allocate between the various types of renewable energy production
- Provide some indication as to how the balance between environmental impacts and the benefits of production might be done, with a requirement to give a range of predicted output, as it is highly subjective matter
- Reinstate clause on AONBs
- Include a statement regarding minimum separation distance between wind turbines and domestic properties
- The statement that 25 years is considered to be ‘temporary’ is at variance with the Inspector’s view in his decision on the Stoneyard Lane appeal
- Amend end of para 5.39 to “...proportionate to the magnitude of effects and project size.”
- Production of guidance should be a pre-requisite of Policy CS3
- Add nuclear generation to list in para 5.35

Other matters raised concerned the preparation and content of the guidance referred to in paragraph 5.41.

Policy CS4 – Renewable and Low Carbon District Heat Networks

(including paragraphs 5.44 - 5.52)

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
0	0	5	2

3.23 All representations received were from developers, agents and the Centre for Sustainable Energy

3.24 The main issues raised were:

- Policy is unduly onerous and likely to represent a barrier to development
- Further feasibility work required to understand the appropriateness and deliverability of progressing heat distribution networks within the new neighbourhoods
- Policy should reflect text at para 5.47 - acknowledge that exceptions should be made to provision where the proposed residential density is less than 50dph

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)

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
0	1	11	2

3.25 Representations were made by developers, agents, interest groups, parish/town councils and a political group. The main issue raised by developers and agents is that the policy needs to include consideration of viability when assessing developer contributions to ensure deliverability.

3.26 Other issues raised concerned matters of clarification and implementation.

Chapter 7 – Tackling Congestion and Improving Accessibility

Policy CS7 – Strategic Transport Infrastructure

(including paragraphs 7.1 - 7.14 and Figures 2 & 3)

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
4	0	26	7

Proposed Changes

3.27 The Highways Agency state that a growth strategy dependent on a new motorway junction may not be deliverable. One political group object to the absence of any public transport extension into the north Yate New Neighbourhood and any park and ride proposals to serve the needs of Yate. Another group want to see an expansion of Smart Ticketing, improved public transport in the Bristol East Fringe and better links from this area to the North Fringe.

December 2011 Core Strategy

3.28 Objections were received from a wide cross-section of interests. Issues raised include:

- Re-opening of the Hallen freight line to passenger services, with associated stations, can only be aspirational given the level of subsidy necessary and inconsistency between Policy CS7, paragraphs 7.6 and 7.13 as to how these rail works would be funded
- Bristol Port Company concerned about the impact of re-introducing passenger services on the Hallen line on freight movements
- Royal Mail concerned that the Cribbs/Patchway transport package will have adverse impact on their operations
- Lack of any reference to the movement of freight or a new junction on M49 at Severnside
- Call by local parish councils and councillors for the re-opening of Highwood Road, Patchway to passenger traffic
- Para 7.1 should include equal commitment to work with Wiltshire and Gloucestershire

Policy CS8 – Improving Accessibility

(including paragraphs 7.15 - 7.22)

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
10	3	3	3

Proposed Changes

3.28 The majority of objections relate to car parking requirements. It was suggested that Criterion 4 should be redrafted to reflect the need for car parking provision to be provided at a level which supports the development process, having been considered against the specific requirements of a development and by the Council. Other comments said that car parking requirements should be considered in

more detail in light of the revision to national policy in PPG13: Transport and informed by an early and complete review of the Council's parking standards.

December 2011 Core Strategy

3.29 The only new issue is the absence of including car parking charges in the policy as a means of demand management.

Chapter 8 – Managing Environmental Resources and Built Heritage

Policy CS9 – Environmental Resources and Built Heritage

(including paragraphs 8.1 – 8.17)

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
10	3	4	0

Proposed Changes

3.35 Objections were mainly received from landowners, developers and agents. The inclusion of text at paragraph 8.12 concerning the repair and re-use of existing buildings was considered unduly onerous and going beyond the provisions of Policy CS9.

December 2011 Core Strategy

3.36 The Woodland Trust considers the policy should include absolute protection for ancient woodland and ancient/veteran trees. A parish council wants a commitment to identifying and protecting buffer zones around international and national areas of conservation.

Policy CS10 – Minerals

(including paragraphs 8.18 – 8.24)

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
3	0	0	0

3.37 The Mineral Products Association commented that the way in which the figure of 58 million tonnes had been derived is not clear. A short paper has since been added to the evidence base (EB49) setting out the working calculations behind this figure.

Chapter 9 – Maintaining Economic Prosperity

Policy CS11 – Distribution of Economic Development Land

(including paragraphs 9.1 - 9.7)

Policy CS12 – Safeguarded Areas for Economic Development

(including paragraphs 9.8 - 9.15 and Tables 1 & 2)

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
22	1	10	1

3.38 The majority of objections were received from agents, developers and landowners.

Proposed Changes

3.39 The main issues raised were:

- The concept of 'Interim Safeguarded Areas' is not sound
- Delete land north of B&Q/Sainsburys, Stoke Gifford from Table 1

December 2011 Core Strategy

3.40 Various sites were referred to in objections:

- Employment Safeguarded Area on Filton Airfield should be increased to 70ha.
- Delete Chapel Lane, Warmley from list of Safeguarded Areas in Table 1
- Land south of Badminton Road, Yate should be deleted from Table 2 and Policy CS12
- Land at Bromley Heath Farm should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for employment
- Delete Minelco/Yate Mills site from list of Interim Safeguarded Areas in Table 2

Policy CS14 – Town Centres and Retail

(including paragraphs 9.22 – 9.30 and Table 3)

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
17	7	32	4

Proposed Changes

3.41 Objections were mainly received from developers and agents. The main issues raised were:

- Robustness and credibility of Retail Study
- Future role of Abbey Wood Retail Park and policy expression in the Core Strategy
- Future role of The Mall/Cribbs Causeway in the absence of Regional Spatial Strategy
- Extent of area and timescale of new district centre at Stoke Gifford

- Clarify role and future floorspace capacity for Yate
- Local impact assessment floorspace figure
- Transport related impacts of additional floorspace growth.
- Motorway service facilities on M49 with new junction

December 2011 Core Strategy

3.42 Objections were received from a cross-section of interests except the general public. The main issues raised relate to the Post-Submission changes to the Core Strategy in respect of The Mall/Cribbs Causeway:

- Opposition to expansion of The Mall/Cribbs Causeway due to impact on other centres within the sub-region and wider area;
- Proposed changes are contrary to national planning policy;
- Status of Cribbs Causeway and The Mall should remain out-of-centre

3.43 In addition comments were made concerning`:

- Abbey Wood Retail Park
- Future floorspace capacity figure identified for Yate
- Rodway Road, Patchway
- Retail provision (including floorspace) for local centre(s) to serve Cribbs/Patchway New Neighbourhood
- New district centre 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)

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
1	2	6	2

3.44 The objections were from planning agents, Oldbury on Severn Parish Council and the Council's Labour Group. The new issues raised concern the inclusion of a reference to overall viability of a development as this will affect density, and that the policy should be able to withstand applications that are 'garden grabbing'.

Policy CS17 – Housing Diversity

(including paragraphs 10.16 – 10.24)

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
0	1	4	2

3.45 The objections were from developers and agents and the Council's Labour Group. Developers and agents want the policy to make specific reference to the viability of development in informing the overall housing mix to be provided. The Labour Group wants the policy to acknowledge that levels of car ownership with flat building/conversion can be a reason for refusing some development/conversions in "sustainable locations".

Policy CS18 – Affordable Housing

(including paragraphs 10.25 – 10.40)

Proposed Changes		Further Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support
25	2	3	0	7	5

3.46 The majority of objections were from developers and agents.

Proposed Changes

3.47 A considerable number of representations objected to the proposed change from "seeking 35% on-site provision ..." to "requiring developers to achieve 35% on-

site ...”, as it is inconsistent with both PPS3 and other sections of the Core Strategy e.g. paragraph 10.27. Other issues included:

- Policy should be flexible with 35% as a starting point for negotiation, depending on viability, required mix and whether it would be more appropriate to make a contribution for off-site provision.
- Policy should provide an overall target, not figure, for the amount of affordable housing and should reflect an assessment of the likely economic viability of land for housing within the area.
- No basis within PPS3 or other national guidance for local authorities to seek a contribution towards affordable housing from employment development
- For consistency with PPS3, ‘figure’ in 6th para should be replaced by ‘target’
- Requirement to achieve mixed and balanced communities contrary to PPS3
- The wording of the ‘financial support measures’ to meet the 35% target is vague and would benefit from greater clarification
- Amend para 10.27 to state that the proportion of affordable housing sought will be negotiated on a site by site basis with regard being had to site specific factors
- No justification given for the statement in para 10.32 that the 35% affordable housing figure can be achieved “in an improving housing market in the medium to longer term, where a real increase in housing prices can be anticipated.”
- No reference to the Homes and Communities Agency’s new ‘Affordable Rent’ model for affordable housing provision
- Introduce graduated scale for <10 dwellings in form of off-site contributions
- Wording in para 10.34a of ‘financial support measures’ to meet the 35% target is vague and requires clarification.
- Viability study should be revised to consider how it may be more appropriate to apply a lower initial affordable housing target, achievable in the current climate, and include mechanisms to enable a review of the target in response to changes in costs and values.

December 2011 Core Strategy

3.48 The main issues raised are:

- A more reasonable target should be set in the short term and periodically reviewed
- Requirement for rural areas should be more flexible
- Recognise relationship between rural affordable housing, employment and transport costs
- Para 10.31b – adopt consistent approach across a site
- Rural Exceptions Schemes should be allowed to be provided alongside neighbourhood plans

Policy CS19 – Rural Housing Exception Sites

(including paragraphs 10.41- 10.51)

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
0	2	4	1

3.49 The main issues raised concern extending the scope of the policy to include sites on edge of urban areas and introducing more flexibility over market housing.

Policy CS20 – Extra Care Housing

(including paragraphs 10.52 – 10.61)

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
4	1	2	0

Proposed Changes

3.50 Objections were raised to the absence of supporting evidence to justify the approach taken in the second paragraph, and that this is inconsistent with the flexibility identified at paragraph 10.55, which addresses viability and appropriateness. Further, it is not feasible or workable to provide affordable units within Extra Care Housing for sale in private sector schemes.

December 2011 Core Strategy

3.51 The two objections relate to the provision of Extra Care Housing in strategic allocations:

- Inappropriate to allocate extra care housing in the strategic allocations, as this approach discounts other potentially available and more suitable sites in other locations, and it has not been proven that these are the most appropriate locations;
- Query justification for 180 Extra Care Homes in Cribbs/Patchway New Neighbourhood – flexibility needed

Policy CS21 – Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

(including paragraphs 10.62 – 10.68)

Proposed Changes		Further Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support
6	1	2	0	9	0

Proposed Changes

3.52 Objections were received from developers and agents and Friends, Families and Travellers. The main issues raised were:

- Lack of evidence to support the deliverability of Gypsy/Traveller provision in the strategic allocations
- Reference should still be made to Circular 1/2006 as it has not yet been withdrawn
- Lack of a criteria based policy gives no aid to people wishing to develop their own site
- Pucklechurch Parish Council referred to 4 sites being incorrectly addressed.

Further Proposed Changes

- Delete Tall Trees, Over Lane from policy and Proposals Map as it does not have permission as a Gypsy and Traveller site

December 2011 Core Strategy

3.53 Objections were received from developers and agents and Friends, Families and Travellers. The main issues raised were:

- Conflict now exists between the criteria based approach introduced and the continued identification of gypsy and traveller pitches at the strategic allocations
- Unreasonable to allocate additional sites in strategic allocations without evidence and without having undertaken a thorough search for genuinely deliverable sites.
- Identification of sites is a matter for the Policies, Sites and Places DPD
- Meeting identified need through windfall applications is contrary to Circular 1/2006 and recent government announcements
- Land adjacent to Gypsy and Traveller site at Meadow View, Pucklechurch, potentially available as an extension to the existing site.
- Exclude Site 12 from list of Gypsy and Traveller sites as the permission does not meet the criteria in para 10.67

Policy CS23 - Community Buildings and Cultural Activity

(including paragraphs 10.74 – 10.80)

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
0	2	5	1

3.54 The majority of objections were made by developers and agents. The main issues raised are:

- Need to ensure the level of contributions remain appropriate and development proposals viable, to ensure delivery.
- Policy makes no reference to community led infrastructure
- Include more about facilities for education and older people

Policy CS24 – Open Space Standards

(including paragraphs 10.81 – 10.93)

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
0	2	5	0

3.55 Objections were raised by developers and agents and the Woodland Trust. The main issues raised are:

- Include reference that contributions will only be sought where clearly justified
- Need to ensure the level of contributions remain appropriate and development proposals viable, to ensure delivery
- Inappropriate to require open space provision in accordance with local standards when the methodology for applying this calculation is not available for review
- Woodland Trust's Woodland Access Standards should be used as a delivery tool to inform the open space standards for GI

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)

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
11	4	9	1

Proposed Changes

3.56 The majority of representations were made by health providers, agents and developers. The main issues raised are:

- Amend point 6a of Policy CS25 to include the following words at the end of the sentence *"and services, including new health and potential social care facilities"*.
- Specific reference to a GP surgery on the Frenchay Hospital site at paragraph 12.6 (bullet point 7) should be deleted as there is not currently an unmet need for additional primary care facilities and the requirement for a GP Surgery can be assessed when the site becomes available.

December 2011 Core Strategy

3.57 Representations were received from agents, landowners and developers. The main issues raised are:

- Object to the provision of a major sports stadium and associated facilities
- Greater clarity should be provided regarding the provision of sports stadia.
- Object to provision of local retailing services at The Mall where this might compromise the delivery of new local centres within the Cribbs/Patchway New Neighbourhood.
- Further clarification required on the process, timescales and extent of allocation of the new Cribbs Causeway centre.
- In Figure 5 the Green Belt notation has not been amended to reflect Policy CS5

Policy CS26 – Cribbs/Patchway New Neighbourhood

(including paragraphs 12.12 - 12.19 and Figure 6)

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
2	4	77	3

Proposed Changes

3.58 The main issue raised is that land west of the A4018 should be formally identified as a 'Reserve site' in the event of housing delivery not achieving the rates required by the Housing Trajectory.

December 2011 Core Strategy

3.59 Representations were received from a wide range of respondents. Two petitions were submitted by the Save Filton Airfield campaign group which have been treated as representations. One was an e-petition signed by 211 people and the other a paper petition signed by 3,443 people. The main issues raised are:

- Opposed to closure and redevelopment of Filton Airfield, loss of green space and the increased housing numbers - the airfield is viable and should be safeguarded
 - Increased housing quantum will have a negative impact on local people and the road network.
 - Lack of communication and consultation with local communities.
 - Concern regarding the principle of releasing Green Belt land to the west of the A4018 ahead of other more appropriate and more sustainable non Green Belt sites.
 - Site identified for release at Haw Wood is not an essential component of the Cribbs/Patchway New Neighbourhood.
 - Green Belt land to the west of the A4018 should not be removed from the Green Belt but should be retained as contingency land.
 - Filton Airfield should be part of new transport limited access spine running from J19 M5 through to Severnside and to M32 and on to new M4 junction.
 - Various comments on the amount of employment land that should be provided
 - Policy needs to be clearer in its support for the retention of the Great Western Air Ambulance and police operations at Filton Airfield.
 - A density of 45 dwellings per hectare is out of character with the neighbouring communities.
 - Absence of a Green Infrastructure strategy and detailed assessment is unsound as it does not meet national and local policies for GI and biodiversity objectives.
 - Policy does not contain sufficient clarity in terms of delivering the retail expansion identified in Policy CS14.
 - Objection to requirement for SPD.
 - Insufficient clarity on the requirements for development proposals and the requirements for SPD. Individual applications should be required to demonstrate compliance with the wider strategic vision and objectives and specifically that they are facilitating and not prejudicing the wider New Neighbourhood development.
 - Patchway Industrial Estate should be included within the sub-regional centre to ensure that it will be commercially viable to bring the site forward for redevelopment.
 - Flexibility should be shown to accommodate a high number of dwellings if required.
 - Major development proposal has potential to have adverse impact on Royal Mail operation during and post construction.
 - Include reference to the preferred vehicular access route to the land west of A4018 – use existing roundabout at the junction of Cribbs Causeway and Lysander Road and use land at Cribbs Lodge Hotel.
 - Policy should specifically state that, in line with Core Strategy's vision, warehousing storage and distribution uses will be directed to Severnside
 - Policy over-wieldly and too long
-

Policy CS27 – East of Harry Stoke New Neighbourhood

(including paragraphs 12.20 - 12.26 and Figure 7)

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
8	0	5	0

3.60 Representations were mainly received from agents and developers. The main issues raised are:

Proposed Changes

- Policy is ambiguous and does not provide clarity on when land will be released from the Green Belt, so the programme for delivery is not clear.
- The delivery of the 2,000 houses provided for on land east of Harry Stoke is heavily constrained – dependent on the Stoke Gifford Transport Link (SGTL).
- Object to development of the land.
- Proposals Map PM64 should be revised to include land to the East of Bolbreck, Filton Road within the settlement boundary and incorporated into the new neighbourhood.
- Consideration should be given to whether the Sainsburys/B&Q should be transferred onto the East of Harry Stoke new neighbourhood land and new district centre located here rather than at Stoke Gifford

December 2011 Core Strategy

- Concerned raised regarding traffic impact from new development on the A38 and the further increase in journey time from Thornbury to Bristol.
- The proposal for homes and the Stoke Gifford Transport Link should not be inextricably linked and as currently worded the policy does not provide sufficient certainty for development to proceed. Amend policy to provide flexibility.
- Concerns raised regarding the principle of releasing Green Belt land to the west of the M32 ahead of other more appropriate and more sustainable non Green Belt sites

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)

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
1	2	5	4

3.61 Representations were mainly from agents and developers and the Council's Labour Group raising issues previously submitted. The following sites were put forward for development:

- Land at Mount Pleasant Farm, Longwell Green
- Land at Abbots Road, Hanham (Hanham Hills)
- Land at Willsbridge Hill
- Land at Warmley
- Land at London Road, Warmley

Chapter 14 – Yate and Chipping Sodbury

Policy CS30 – Yate and Chipping Sodbury

(including paragraphs 14.1 – 14.15 and Figure 11)

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
7	2	5	9

Policy CS31 – North Yate New Neighbourhood

(including paragraphs 14.16 – 14.25 and Figure 12)

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
11	2	7	1

Proposed Changes

3.62 Objections were received from developers and agents, Yate Liberal Democrats/Town Council and the Highways Agency:

- 3,000 dwellings should be provided in the plan period, not 2,400
- Query the assumption that delivery of 3,000 homes and up to 9ha of employment land can be achieved.
- Object to the allocation of land at north Yate and to the lack of park & ride provision.
- Object to the amendment to housing density in Policy CS31 of 45 dwellings per hectare, on the grounds of a lack of reasoning.
- Object to the introduction of new wording within Policy CS31 and at paragraph 14.19 of “up to” rather than ‘a minimum of’ 9 ha of employment land.
- Promotion of Land at Engine Common to contribute towards housing and employment land.
- Should be explained that in Figure 12 Green Infrastructure lying outside of the new neighbourhood is a representation of what exists and not part of the new neighbourhood proposal.
- Status of Figure 12 as ‘illustrative’ questioned.

December 2011 Core Strategy

3.63 Representations were received from members of the public and agents. A number of representations support the Core Strategy not identifying land at Engine Common for development. The main issues raised are:

- Opposed to North Yate New Neighbourhood due to no clear justification for significant loss of countryside, level of traffic increase and issue of sustainability of transport.
- Promotion of land at Peg Hill and east of Chipping Sodbury for development.
- Discrepancies between various policies in relation to dwelling delivery figures.

Chapter 15 – Thornbury

Policy CS32 and CS33 – Thornbury and Housing Opportunity Area

(including paragraphs 15.1 – 15.14 and Figure 13)

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
74	6	54	48

Proposed Changes

3.64 Comments were submitted by local residents, interest groups and developers. The main issues raised are:

- Object to development at Park Farm – further detailed critique of the Council's conclusions on the suitability of the site for development and rejection of Sustainability Appraisal conclusions.
- Promotion of Land at 'Morton Way South' for development and to north east of Thornbury
- Objection to Policy CS32 on the grounds that it prejudices the outcome of the NHS review of community healthcare facilities and that the objective to improve healthcare facilities through the regeneration of Thornbury Hospital and Health Centre is linked to residential development in Thornbury.
- Buffer zones added to Figure 13 should be determined through the development management process.
- Object to Figure 13 which shows the transport link through Castle School which would impact on the Conservation Area and lead to congestion and highway safety problems on Park Road.
- Object to references to design inserted into Policy CS33 – this should be designed and progressed through the Development Management process.
- Object to lack of consultation regarding future Castle School development.
- Object to providing contributions to enable the consolidation of Castle School.

December 2011 Core Strategy

3.65 Representations were received from three planning agents, but most were received from local residents. Save Thornbury's Green Heritage and a number of residents continue to object to the identification of land at Park Farm for development, citing a deficient public consultation, site-selection and Sustainability Appraisal process, as well as the scheduling of the Medieval Fishponds in 2011 and other grounds, as reasons for objection. Thornbury Town Council reaffirmed support for Park Farm, while individual Town Councillors from the North West Ward continue to object.

3.66 Some residents are opposed to the principle of any greenfield development in Thornbury. A number of other residents object to speculative developer proposals for development along Morton Way, with some stating support for Park Farm over Morton Way as their preferred location. Objections to development along Morton Way have been recorded as support as the Core Strategy does not identify land along Morton Way for development.

Chapter 16 – Rural Areas

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
8	3	15	122

Proposed Changes

3.67 Representations were received from agents/developers and Friends of the Earth. The main issues raised are:

- Promotion of sites for development in rural areas, including at Tytherington and Westerleigh.
- The requirement for enhancement of the built and natural environment is not realistic for all developments.
- Should be flexibility within the policy for amendments to be made in the light of the Localism Bill/ Act in respect of rural housing and the “Community Right to Build” initiative.
- No justification for retaining the settlement boundaries in all circumstances, particularly when the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land at the present time.
- Criteria 4 of Policy CS34 should make provision for the development of small scale sites (including encouraging brownfield sites) in the Green Belt, which would not conflict with the objectives of PPG2 Green Belts.
- Without a review of the Green Belt or release of sites within the Green Belt, the Core Strategy’s vision may not be deliverable.

December 2011 Core Strategy

3.68 The majority of representations were from members of the public expressing support for the Core Strategy, as it does not allocate land at Woodlands Farm, Frampton Cotterell for development and they are opposed to the current speculative housing proposal on this site. The main issues raised are:

- There should be a review of settlement and Green Belt boundaries as part of the Core Strategy to allow settlements to meet their housing needs.
- Situation for villages which have no defined village boundary is unclear
- Amend Green Belt and settlement boundaries for Bitton to allow land to the south west to come forward for development
- Promotion of rural sites for development –
 - Woodlands Farm, Frampton Cotterell
 - Bristol Road, Frampton Cotterell
 - Westerleigh Road, Westerleigh
 - Wooton Road, Charfield
- Greater emphasis should be given to Neighbourhood Plans than just “taken account of”.
- Land between Old Passage/Aust and New Passage/Severn Beach should be identified as a buffer zone to the SPA/SAC/Ramsar/SSSI designations in the Severn Estuary and all development/change of use refused.
- Include reference to the decommissioning of the Magnox Station.

Chapter 17 – Severnside

Policy CS35 – Severnside

(including paragraphs 17.1 – 17.23 and Figure 14)

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
34	2	5	0

Proposed Changes

3.69 Representations were received from the Highways Agency, Environment Agency and agents acting on behalf of landowners. The main issues raised are:

- Object to the Council attempting to exercise control over development when extant permissions exist
- Object to the need for a Flood Risk Assessment to come forward before further development can take place.
- Council doesn't have all the flood risk evidence required, as the Level 2 SFRA for Avonmouth/Severnside is still not completed.
- No clear Flood Risk Management strategy to enable development and there needs to be an agreed strategic infrastructure package for this area.
- Question why the last sentence in paragraph 17.16 has been removed. Not aware of any evidence to demonstrate that the scale of development can be accommodated within the existing network or through acceptable mitigation measures
- Developers should meet with the Highways Agency prior to development coming forward.

December 2011 Core Strategy

3.70 Representations were received from the Environment Agency, the agents for Scottish Power and a local resident. The main issues raised are:

- A joint strategic framework for the area should be developed to regulate development without improved flood defences.
- Object to development needing to be in conformity with the LDF and there is no obligation for landowners to assist in the preparation of management and delivery plans.
- Object to development funding all new required infrastructure.
- Concern about the impact on local traffic levels that further development would have.

Chapter 18 – Major Infrastructure Projects

Proposed Changes		Further Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support	Object	Support
2	0	5	0	8	0

Proposed Changes

3.71 Representations were received from the Highways Agency. They request specific reference to ensuring applications for Major Infrastructure Projects are accompanied by robust transport assessments and mitigate any adverse impacts. In respect of Policy CS37 they highlight the importance of a robust transport assessment and travel plan and the need to understand the impact of the proposed legacy uses on the Strategic Road Network.

Further Proposed Changes

3.72 Representations were received from the agents for Horizon Nuclear Power. They made many comments on Chapter 18 and put forward a re-worded chapter. In addition they objected that the framework for the location and scale of new development does not currently take into account the potential investment in a new nuclear power station at Oldbury-on-Severn and the consequent socio-economic implications.

December 2011 Core Strategy

3.73 Representations received included those from the agents for Horizon Nuclear Power and Scottish Power. The main issues raised by Horizon Nuclear Power are:

- Acceptance of justification for Core Strategy to set principles to inform the Council's role in production of a Local Impact Report
- Acceptance of policy concerned with development that falls to the Council to determine.
- The Core Strategy sets tests for a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects that could be seen as assuming a status above that accorded by the 2008 Planning Act.
- Premature to identify potential impacts of nuclear new-build
- Grant of Development Consent Order would necessitate a review of the Core Strategy.

In addition they identify numerous wording changes, to clarify the Council's various planning roles, to update to reflect recent changes in planning context, to re-state IPC guidance and to remove duplication.

3.74 The following issues were raised by other respondents:

- Oldbury on Severn is unsuitable for further nuclear development, it should be a coastal site where cooling towers are not necessary.
- The requesting of delivery plans is very unclear and also suggests that preparation is binding rather than voluntary.
- There should be controls during the long construction phase to prevent disruption in road usage, employment, costs of local resources and housing costs and strong landscaping to break the visual bulk of the new plant.
- Add flood risk to list of issues in CS37
- 1st sentence in paras 18.7 and 18.23 should be deleted

- Object that the Council is pre-judging all current tidal power technology as not complying with other policies in this document supporting renewable energy development subject to environmental safeguards.

Chapter 19 – Implementation and Monitoring

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
1	0	0	0

3.75 An agent objected to Table 4, as follows:

- Implementation mechanisms do not take account of extant permissions at Severnside and, therefore, the need to consider other mechanisms (e.g. Design Codes) to deliver and objectives of Core Strategy
- Implementation framework does not take account of New Homes Bonus and New Business Bonus

Glossary of Terms

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
2	0	0	1

3.76 The Home Builders Federation object to the inclusion of Building for Life (BfL) in the Glossary, as it was an assessment tool devised by the Home Builders Federation to provide guidance to encourage good design. It was never intended to be applied as a mandatory standard.

3.77 An agent objects that Concept Statements are still defined in the Glossary given that reference to them has been removed from the main document.

Appendices

Appendix 4 – Extract from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
1	0	0	0

3.78 An agent objects that Appendix 4 needs to be based on a robust and transparent assessment of affordable housing need and should be updated to have regard to the introduction of the Affordable Rent.

Appendix 5 - Green Infrastructure, Sport and Recreation Standards

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
2	0	0	0

3.79 Two agents raised objections to the Standards:

- The introduction of standards is inappropriate and confusing and should be deleted.
- As the audit the standards are based on has yet to be published, the standards are not based upon a robust evidence base as required by both PPS12 and PPG17.

Appendix 6 – Coal Resources

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
1	0	0	0

3.80 The Coal Authority considered that the inclusion of 2 plans within the same appendix may lead to confusion and suggested that that the Coal Mining Development Referral Area Plan be included as a separate Appendix entitled 'Appendix 7 – Coal Mining Legacy'.

Proposals Map

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
4	0	2	0

Proposed Changes

3.81 Objections to Proposals Map changes were made by an agent and Yate Liberal Democrats:

- The three smaller areas on the plan PM3 (Northfield) are not properly strategic matters that should be included within the Core Strategy
- Badminton Court/Dairy Crest should be extended to include the station site and any redevelopment should make provision for equivalent station parking and access
- Stone Mills at Yate should shown on Proposals Map as suitable for a town centre use e.g. local centre
- Stover and North road Industrial Site – object to riverbank on the northern boundary being included. This is the Frome Valley Walkway and must be preserved as a riverside walkway.

December 2011 Core Strategy

3.82 Objections have been made to:

- remove land at Filton Road and to the west from the Green Belt
- show area identified at Oldbury as suitable for a new nuclear power station in the National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation

General/Other Issues

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
3	2	16	5

3.83 The representations received relate to matters of a general nature, policy omissions or comments which don't fall within a particular chapter/topic.

3.84 The main issues raised are:

- Council should make clear how its core strategy complies with the 'duty to cooperate' and how the scale, distribution and delivery of both housing and retail development has and will be co-ordinated with neighbouring authorities in the West of England
- Policy Omissions:
 - Surface water policy
 - Policy to protect bus depots and bus stations
 - Policy to allow development in non Green Belt semi-rural locations adjacent to groups of existing houses at the edge or just beyond the edge of town/village boundaries
 - Policy to limit a) the number (density) of shops that are converted into flats and b) businesses such as takeaways and amusement arcades that can operate within a certain area
 - Policy which supports the provision of two major sports stadiums in place of Local Plan Policy LC6
- Council is not recognising Green Belt policy change in NPPF relating to previously developed land
- No reference to the significance of industrial and commercial developments in the vicinity of a nuclear installation, which have the potential to constitute an external hazard.
- Council should identify process for making better use of empty homes and vacant space on business park using CPO where possible
- Special attention should be paid to youth provision – for example outdoor facilities such as an additional skateboard park
- Cycling provision between Yate and Chipping Sodbury needs to be accessible, ie along a fairly level route
- Concerned that there is little provision for bungalows to be built within the new housing areas
- Establish a mechanism to ensure that checks are made regularly on all sites where there is an agricultural occupancy condition – to ensure they are not lost by default
- Core Strategy not sustainable and not complied with due process in respect of Filton Airfield, as claimed by reference to material obtained via Freedom of Information.

Sustainability Appraisal Report and Appendices

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
20	0	7	0

3.85 The majority of representations to the Proposed Changes were received from developers and agents and residents of Thornbury. The main issues raised are:

- It is not the process by which the strategic housing requirement should be established.
- Appraisal of strategic locations incomplete as it does not assess the potential for rural settlements to accommodate growth
- The Sustainability Appraisal is flawed and inaccurate in respect of Thornbury and the Housing Opportunity Area
- The Sustainability Appraisal does not offer a relative evaluation of development at Yate/Sodbury as compared to development elsewhere - fails to comply with the legal obligations post St Albans
- Inaccurate sustainability ratings and comments in respect of land at Engine Common and at north Yate
- Matrices in Appendix 8 have not been updated in response to changes in the Core Strategy
- Query why there is no corresponding section for Yate and Chipping Sodbury when Thornbury Town Centre Strategy is in Appendix

Evidence Base

Proposed Changes		Dec 2011 Core Strategy	
Object	Support	Object	Support
1	0	12	0

3.86 Representations were received from a cross-section of interests. The main issues raised are:

Strategic Green Belt Assessment

- Assessment does not go far enough as it is only concerned with 'strategic scale' development and therefore does not provide any confidence that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period
- Review fails to take account of the potential need to release land from the Green Belt for employment land provision, instead focusing solely on housing need
- The indication that smaller sites will be reviewed through other DPDs and/or through Neighbourhood Planning should not apply to land which can meet a strategic need and can be brought forward now
- Assessment has taken an insufficiently narrow approach and has not considered the impact of Green Belt changes on traffic flows and the trans-Green Belt market towns
- Assessment overstates the contribution that land west of A4018 makes to the purposes of Green Belt
- Site at Filton Road does not share the same characteristics associated with the wider 'Harry Stoke / Hambrook / M32 Corridor up to M4' area

The Mall Retail Impact Assessment

- The evidence is deficient and the study is inadequate for the scale and significance of the policy aspiration

Infrastructure Delivery Plan

- The range and level of contributions sought continue to increase with each review
- Viability appraisal tools should be utilised to ensure the level of contributions remain appropriate and development proposals viable, to ensure delivery
- Concerned with the revised comments in relation to education provision within the Cribbs / Patchway new neighbourhood
- Detailed comments on location and phasing should be removed

3.87 One member of the public considers that the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is fundamentally flawed and not fit to be used in determining planning applications. English Heritage query whether a Council officer's report on alternative sites in Thornbury for housing is in the public domain and whether it was used in the compilation of the SEA.

List of Respondents

A. Proposed Changes

ID	Respondent Name
1054305	Alan Pinder - Friends of the Earth
1060577	Judith Payne - Thornbury Town Council
1061057	D Bailey - Pucklechurch Parish Council
1121217	Di Aldrich
1173089	Rachael Wright
1185761	Zoe Stiles - Pioneer Property Services Ltd
1215297	Roger Allen
1411553	Liz Summers - GVA Grimley
2604577	Justin Milward - Woodland Trust
2796641	Rachael Bust - The Coal Authority
2799265	Graham Parker - PJ Planning
2803041	J Ashman - Highways Agency
2803777	Cathy Francis - King Sturge - North Bristol NHS
2819809	R Brady
2819841	Mr David Fear - Fearson Homes
2820449	Mr Graham Lanfear
2827777	Marilyn Palmer - Campaign to Protect Rural England AVONSIDE
2880673	David Lander - Boyer Planning Ltd
2880833	Kathy Curling - Pro Planning - on behalf of Hitchings
2880929	Marcus Plaw - Colliers CRE
2881121	Rob Duff - Pegasus Planning
3061153	Glynn and Elizabeth Griffiths
3114241	Sarah Allen - Avon Fire and Rescue Service
318177	John Phillips - Phillips Planning and Development
3212545	Chris Willmore - Yate Liberal Democrats
3212609	MM Wise
3245505	Jeff Richards - WYG Planning & Design
330561	Andy Perkins - South Gloucestershire Labour Group
3354113	I Jewson - Ian Jewson Planning Ltd
335553	Kate Tinsley - Peacock & Smith obo Wm. Morrison Supermarkets Plc
347713	Simon Fitton - RPS – Crest
3549793	Charles Eardley-Wilmot - Concern for Thornbury
3557665	Peter Roberts - Barton Willmore
3563809	Natalie Field - NHS South Gloucestershire

ID	Respondent Name
3763393	Jennie Bennett
3780065	Rob Hudson
3784801	Grace Davies - Save Thornbury's Green Heritage
3790273	Christine Rickard
383105	Sian Parry - Avon Wildlife Trust
3855041	Derek Campbell
3872257	Norman Wright
388161	Stephen Staines - Friends, Families & Travellers
3913217	Ruth Diggle - NLP on behalf of PRUIM Ltd
3919329	Robert W Chilcraft
3919361	Lucy Chilcraft
3921217	Benedict Paul O'Donohoe
3923777	Sally Osborne
3925441	Gareth Davies
3945281	Adam Neil - New Earth Solutions
3957441	F Herod
3957601	G Herod
3958977	Anthony Holliday
3961313	Robert Sheehan
3961345	Georgina Eveline Mary Sheehan
3967169	Matthew Shellum - McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd.
3973729	Mervyn Darville
3973889	Ronald Hayhurst
3974529	Gillian Dunkley
3974881	Malcolm Ratcliff - Mineral Products Association
3983041	Linda Burgess
3984673	Thomas Lloyd
3989729	Gordon Thomas
4002881	R W Gorham
4002977	S Gorham
4003233	Rachel Robinson - WYG Planning & Design on behalf of Sainsbury's Supermarkets...
4008961	Carol Williams
4008993	T Williams
4012737	Jeff Richards - Bloor Homes (South West) Ltd

Appendix 1

ID	Respondent Name
3664705	Dave Rowley
4020257	John Baker - Strategic Land Partnerships (Mr Tim Baker)
4020481	Ian Mellor - Terramond Ltd
4026465	Martin Leay - Badminton Estate (Mr S Dring)
4032065	Peter Stacey - Turley Associates - Persimmon & Ashfield
4038145	Dominic Lawson - Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning Ltd
4046401	Jonathan Adams - Tetlow King Planning Ltd - McBraida
4048417	Jonathan Bailey
4050433	Simon Lewis
4050465	S A Lewis
4051649	Bethany Tucker - National Grid
4052705	M Handford
4053761	Paul Kentish - Paul Kentish & Co and RPS
4053985	C Ashforth
4054017	Allan Williams
4055457	Rosemary Burton
4144129	Jonathan Adams - Tetlow King - Logersham Developments
4144385	Simon Fitton - RPS - Strategic Land Partnerships
4389697	M L Neale
4390433	A Fricker
4574721	Rob Duff - On Behalf of SDLL
4604737	Matthew Morris - GVA - on behalf of Dominion
4604801	Matthew Morris - GVA - on behalf of Axa Sun Life
4604833	Matthew Morris - GVA - on behalf of F&C
4604897	Harry Sedman - Origin3 - Engineering & Allied Holdings

ID	Respondent Name
4012929	Simon Prescott - Bovis Homes
4604961	Simon Prescott - Barton Willmore - on behalf of Harrow & Hitchins
4604993	Simon Prescott - Barton Willmore - on behalf of Scout Enterprises
4605025	Lindsay Thompson - Terence O'Rourke - Strategic Land Partnerships
4605057	Chris Green - DPP - on behalf of Tesco
4605089	Craig O'Brien - Savills - on behalf of TJ Hughes
4605185	Chris Davies - Darwin Gray LLP
4605217	Adrienne Pemberton
4605249	Edward Pemberton
4605281	Ray Pioli
4605313	Stephen & Hannah Wiltshire
4605345	Rosemary Clews
4605377	Grace Davies
4605409	BE Kealing
4605729	Matt & Liz Sanderson
4605889	MJ & DJ Whallett
4606337	Tim Pearce - Castle Estate Agents
4606689	Mark Phillips - Peer Group Plc
4606721	Richard Daone - Bath & North East Somerset Council
4606785	Barbara Morgan - Network Rail
4728417	Rhys Lewis & Leanne Hotson
803489	Rose Freeman - The Theatres Trust
805601	Richard Bull - Environment Agency
805665	Jamie Sullivan - Tetlow King Planning - RP Planning Consortium
936417	Julie Clay - Yate Town Council

B. Further Proposed Changes

ID	Respondent Name
1207937	James Stevens, Home Builders Federation Ltd
2859809	David Cowell - Marine Management Organisation
3557665	Peter Roberts - Barton Willmore
4032065	Peter Stacey - Turley Associates - Persimmon & Ashfield
4055617	Tim Roberts - Horizon Nuclear Power

ID	Respondent Name
4606785	Barbara Morgan - Network Rail
4889857	Matthew Kendrick - Grassroots Planning - Severnside Homes
803489	Rose Freeman - The Theatres Trust
805665	Jamie Sullivan - Tetlow King Planning - RP Planning Consortium

Appendix 1

C. December 2011 Core Strategy

ID	Respondent Name
1012161	Andrew Edgington
1029377	Andrew & Catherine Rigler
1052961	John Hallett
1054017	Nigel Hutchings - Business West
1060385	Paula Evans - Iron Acton Parish Council
1060577	Judith Payne - Thornbury Town Council
1060673	Angela Hocking - Downend and Bromley Heath Parish Council
1060993	John Snowden - Rockhampton Parish Council
1061089	Leigh-Ann Jefferies - Siston Parish Council
1092449	Claire Rees
1121217	Di Aldrich
1124993	Clare Fardell - South Gloucestershire Council
1127233	Alice Rigler
1173089	Rachael Wright
1288993	Donna Damzelle
1298497	Sarah Cleaver
1312193	Michael Archer
1332545	Julie Williams
1343969	Wyn Griffiths
1382241	Phil Handy
1397153	Colin James Waterhouse
1404897	Richard Lloyd
1410017	Gareth Leadbetter
1410849	Amanda Grundy - Natural England
1411553	Liz Summers - GVA Grimley
1415809	Christopher Brown
1429857	Lucy Hamid - Patchway Town Council
1442945	C Jackson - D2 Planning Limited
1944417	Rob Collis
2010401	Carol Harrison
2596225	Hayley Townsend - Yate Town Council
2604321	Guy Bailey - RPS on behalf of Avon and Somerset Constabulary
330593	Chris Wilmore - Yate Town Council
3354113	I Jewson - Ian Jewson Planning Ltd
3361185	John Bone
347713	Simon Fitton - RPS - Crest
3549665	John Jackson

ID	Respondent Name
2604577	Justin Milward - Woodland Trust
2792385	Gillian Flook
2796353	Michael Keenan - Save Engine Common Action Group
2796641	Rachael Bust - The Coal Authority
2797889	Barry Turner - Oldbury-on-Severn Parish Council
2799265	Graham Parker - PJ Planning
2802113	Mr Simon de Beer - Bath and North East Somerset Council
2803745	Caroline Power - English Heritage
2804033	Jane Hennell - British Waterways
2807553	Dave Redgewell - South West Transport Network
2819841	David Fear - Fearson Homes
2820449	Mr Graham Lanfear
2823553	R & W Bawn
2880641	Craig Noel - Strutt & Parker LLP Planning & Development
2880673	David Lander - Boyer Planning Ltd
2881121	Rob Duff - Pegasus Planning
2948033	Jane Davey - Parish Plan
2949121	Anthony England
2949345	Ann Jones
2949921	Brian Delve
3145601	Cem Kosaner - NLP on behalf of Redrow
318177	John Phillips - Phillips Planning and Development
318945	Stella Beecher
3190177	Tim Pyper - Aust PC
319585	Ann Fay - British Horse Society
3196129	Kieran Warren - Frampton Cotterell Parish Council
320641	Marilyn Palmer - Campaign for the Protection of Rural England-
320737	Tim Roberts - DLP Planning Ltd
3212545	Chris Willmore - Yate Liberal Democrats
3245505	Jeff Richards - WYG Planning & Design
3253377	Jane Strickland - Frampton Cotterell Parish Council
330561	Andy Perkins - South Gloucestershire Labour Group
3790273	Christine Rickard
4003233	Rachel Robinson - WYG Planning & Design obo Sainsbury's
4004385	Christopher Rickard
4008961	Carol Williams
4008993	T Williams

Appendix 1

ID	Respondent Name
3554817	Chris Windows & Mark Weston - Bristol City Council
3557665	Peter Roberts - Barton Willmore
3707809	Meghan Rossiter – Tetlow King - Bromley Heath Road
3756769	Helen Sydenham
3763201	Gerrit-Jan Rollema
3763393	Jennie Bennett
377505	Colin Armorgie
3780065	Rob Hudson
3784801	Grace Davies - Save Thornbury's Green Heritage
383105	Sian Parry - Avon Wildlife Trust
388161	Stephen Staines - Friends, Families & Travellers
3913217	Ruth Diggle - NLP on behalf of the owners of the Mall
3919329	Robert W Chilcraft
3924001	Gill Denning
3925441	Gareth Davies - North West Thornbury Town Councillors
3945409	Nigel Cant - Nigel Cant Planning
3956609	Peter Dryell
3961185	Michael Camm - Hanham District Green Belt Conservation Society
3961633	Terry & Barbara Ray
3971073	Bryan Smith - The Bristol Port Company
3973249	John & Mavis Richings
3974529	Gillian Dunkley
3988289	Rosie Farquhar - Terence O'Rourke - on behalf of BAE Systems
3991489	Michael Lock
399617	Dodington Parish Council
4604897	Harry Sedman - Origin3 - Engineering & Allied Holdings
4605281	Ray Pioli
4606785	Barbara Morgan - Network Rail
464577	Terry Webber – Winterbourne Medieval Barn Trust
4889857	Matthew Kendrick - Grassroots Planning - Severnside Homes
4975777	Ian Scott - South Gloucestershire Council, Filton Ward
4975873	Ian Boulton
4975969	Sam Scott - South Glos
4986209	Geoff Haddock
4987073	John Christensen - Great Western Air

ID	Respondent Name
4009249	John Allen
4012737	Jeff Richards - Bloor Homes (South West) Ltd
4012865	Jacqueline Mulliner - Bloor Homes and Barratt Developments Plc
4020257	John Baker - Strategic Land Partnerships
4022241	Ian Beckey - Living Easton
4024481	Catherine Seddon - Jones Lang LaSalle
4030433	Kevin Hunt - on behalf of Cribbs Lodge Hotel
4032065	Peter Stacey - Turley Associates - Persimmon & Ashfield
4038145	Dominic Lawson - Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning Ltd
4044353	Des Dunlop - D2 Planning Ltd
4046401	Jonathan Adams - Tetlow King Planning Ltd - McBrida
4051713	Peter and Jo Eickhoff
4052929	Rosy Collis
4053761	Paul Kentish - Paul Kentish & Co
4054593	Alun Howells
4055457	Rosemary Burton
4055617	Tim Roberts - Horizon Nuclear Power
4058049	Tim Roberts - Mr Simon Atherton (Atherton Family Trust)
4144129	Jonathan Adams - Tetlow King - Logersham Developments
4144449	Peter Stacey - Turley Associates - Taylor Wimpey
417633	Alex Wilson - Fulfords Land & Planning Services
4301601	Gregory Gray - Gregory Gray Associates - Thornbury Garden Centre
4301825	David Bate
4388737	Sue and Dave Winfield
4574721	Rob Duff - On Behalf of SDLL
4596353	Dan Parry-Jones - BNP Paribas on behalf of Royal Mail
4604737	Matthew Morris - GVA
6031745	Nigel Furness
6031777	Janet & Ashley Haigh (2 reps)
6031809	Bob Harnett
6031841	Bob Harper
6031873	Kate Kelliher
6031905	Jane Stenner
6031937	Clive Matthews
6031969	P M Mitchell-Reid

Appendix 1

ID	Respondent Name
	Ambulance
4997697	Wayne Dyer - Arup on behalf of Scottish Power
5020129	L Howard
5113153	Andrew Roberts - Highways Agency
5113409	David Roake
5121473	Michael Gilmont
5128193	Colin Chapman - Bristol City Council
5128385	Alan Piper - BS10 Planning & Parks Group
5130753	John Dilks
5134721	A H Driver
5134785	Jane Driver
5139041	R G Franklin
5453761	Yana Bosseva - RenewableUK
5722337	Robert Hindle - Save Filton Airfield Campaign
5722529	Andy Samuels
5722753	Dave Jones
5760865	David Tiley - Patchway Town Council
5766881	Pamela Tainton
5915489	Peter V.F. Sumner
5918753	S & Virginia Jackson
5936513	Ann Pinnock
5940065	Ian Armour
5975585	Mary Stevens
6006465	C Rose - CSJ Planning Consultants - on behalf of David Wilson homes
6009345	IW & VW Larkin
6017665	Jim Mason
6022017	Angela Jacobs - Turley Associates - Persimmon & Maximus - East of Chipping Sodbury
6031681	Paul Bailey
6107905	C Watson
6107969	Fred & Joyce Hedges
6108225	J Bennett
6110529	Alan Payne
6110593	Chris & Diana Hancock
6110657	Janet Raven
6112769	Richard Plant - Stiles Harold Williams on behalf of Minelco Ltd
6114273	Gerry Pitman
6114305	Ceri Morgan-Davies
6116257	Wendy Gazzard
6119969	Rod & Penny Isaacs
6120801	Ed Gazzard
6129025	Alan Rowlands
6129057	C Sanders
6129665	Andrew Allsop

ID	Respondent Name
6032001	Mark Quinn
6032033	Rachel Trudgian
6032065	Jane & Alan Yarrow
6033601	James & J I Goodman (2 reps)
6035521	Veronica Cutland - Frampton Cotterell Women's Institute
6040417	Brian Mannering
6040449	Norman Cross
6041409	L M Rennison
6041441	J & BM Whitehart
6041473	MC & FJ Staley
6043585	Claire Warren
6044257	A W Lavender
6054753	Malcolm & Sue Behling
6054785	Stephen Jones
6054817	John & Jill Maunder
6054849	Mark Newton
6054913	John Preedy
6054945	Valerie Revell
6054977	Margaret Sanders
6055009	Dave & Jacky Watson
6055041	Elspeth Wilkins
6055745	Derek & Dorothy Dibble
6058785	Christopher Bouch
6058817	L England
6107681	MJ & JA Burcher
6107713	J A Jones
6107745	John Mclevy - We Love Almondsbury
6107777	Sophie Newton
6107873	C R G Ward
6136545	Katheryn Wedlock
6136609	Steve Wedlock
6136641	David V Mitchell
6136705	Ian Butcher - WCS Environmental
6136737	John F Rogers
6136769	Green Planning Solutions on behalf of Ayres
6136897	Paul Cousins
6136929	Pat Merrick
6137025	Richard Merrick
6137153	Tony Collins - Collins & Coward on behalf of Hewlett Packard
6137185	K Johnston
6138465	Susan Alexander
6138497	Susan Bowley

Appendix 1

ID	Respondent Name
6134369	James Amos & Maggie Hill
6134401	Chris Awde
6134433	S Cheang
6134465	Mair Gapper
6134497	Sue & Blair Goddard
6134529	Gill Greef
6134561	David & Miriam Gudgeon
6134593	Pat Homer
6134625	Godfrey Laundry
6134689	Philip & Christine Lawrence
6134721	Judith Lee
6135169	Christine Palmer
6135233	Andrew Peggram
6135265	Adrian & Linda Porter
6135329	Roy & Shirley Pitt
6135361	Guy Powell
6135393	Andrew Pym
6135425	Julian Selman
6135489	Heather Smith
6135521	Phil Stephens
6135585	M Wait
6135617	Fran Walters
6135681	G Wenczek
6135713	Stephen Groves
6135745	Malcolm & Margaret Gibbon
6135777	Paula Fromberg
6135809	Rosemary Cross
6136449	Graham Quick - North Somerset Council
6136481	Keith Bohr
6136513	Maureen & Bob Randall
6146113	Peter Abraham - Bristol City Council Conservative Group
6150945	John Pearce
6151201	Hollie Bryant - Pegasus Planning - on behalf of Keller & Keller
6151553	Cathy Hall - GL Hearn on behalf of IRERE (Galleries)
6151585	Cathy Hall - GL Hearn on behalf of Queensbury Real Estate
6151713	Liz Summers - GVA on behalf of North Bristol NHS
6151745	Oliver Dearden, Mike Littleton & Lloyd - Bristol Aero Collection
6151905	Andrew Brown - Praxis Real Estate Management on behalf of Nethermost Estates
6151937	Daniel Templeton - Turley Associates obo Bristol Alliance
6153665	Chris Cox - Origin3 on behalf of Tileflair
6153825	Jim Tarzey - Pegasus Planning obo Gloucestershire County Cricket Club
6151713	Liz Summers - GVA on behalf of North Bristol NHS

ID	Respondent Name
6139521	Rosalyn Ball
6139553	Jack Bennett
6139585	Gareth Constable
6139969	Jenny Gilbert
6140001	JJ & JA Knott
6140129	Jean & Raymond Holland
6140961	Karl Scholz - Alder King - on behalf of Bailey-Scudamore
6140993	John Din
6141025	Christopher Greef
6141057	Paul Harrison
6141089	Nick Large
6141121	S J Powell
6141153	John & Anne Shepherd
6141185	J E Snailum
6141217	Richard Warburton
6141377	Tim Fenner
6141409	Sarah Lynett
6141441	James Shepherd
6141921	Sylvia Sears
6142465	Dave Woodward
6142721	Tina Sorrell
6144225	Caroline & Alex Macdonald
6144257	Hugh Morgan
6144289	Cath Mumby
6144353	R J Roylance
6144385	Susan Stevens
6144577	Colin & Angela Edgcombe
6144609	Mr M, Mrs J & Mr MJ Elton
6144705	A C Jones
6144769	G R Snailum
6145857	Andy & Sharon Irving
6146049	Barry Turner - Parish Liaison Group
6176513	Mick Garnier
6176769	Catherine Knott
6176833	Jackie H Latham
6176897	Heather Luna
6176929	Philip & Juliet Mansfield
6177025	Julie McKay
6179137	Nic Peglar
6179329	Ralph Butt - Morris & Co obo Messers Grace/Moorlen/ Barnes
6179425	Ray Renwick
6179521	Robert Chappell

Appendix 1

ID	Respondent Name
6154209	Stuart Rackham - Pegasus Planning on behalf of Mr Hill (Wotton Rd)
6154305	Peter Crouch - Merlin Housing Society
6155073	Steve Townsend - Weston Town Centre Partnership
6174209	J S C Angell
6174337	Phil Barker
6174465	Jason Bidwell
6174561	W H Casling
6174753	Kirstie Bidwell
6175169	Mike J Murch - Charlton Commoners
6175425	Adam Clark
6175649	Christopher & Susan Cunningham-Burley
6176001	Paul Duckett
6176129	Peter & Jenifer Dugard
6176481	Derek & Jean Fray
6191745	Paul Lee - Save Filton Airfield
6191841	Matt Tipper - Unite The Union South West
6192033	John Highton - Office for Nuclear Regulation
6192161	Marisa Parkin
6197953	Ruth Diggle - NLP on behalf of PRUPIM
6210913	Amanda Milton

ID	Respondent Name
6179553	Ian Roberts
6179617	Joan Rolfe
6179649	Marcello Ruta
6179873	Jude Taylor
6180129	Sonia Taylor
6180513	Julie Williams
6180609	Fay Winfield
6183873	Rosie Farquhar - Terence O'Rourke obo Persimmon, BAE, Ashfield...
6187873	Rebecca Collins - GVA on behalf of RBS Thornbury
6188161	Rachael Lark - SF Planning on behalf of Mr J Hawtin
6188353	Liz Summers - GVA on behalf of Friends Life
6188385	Liz Summers - GVA on behalf of Hydrock Group
6191489	Andy Chubb - Filton Town Councillor
6191521	Melanie Drewitt - Filton Town Councillor
6191553	Adam Gooch - Gloucester City Council
6191617	Liz Beth - Centre for Sustainable Energy
6210977	R Underhill
6289633	M Townsend
803489	Rose Freeman - The Theatres Trust
805601	Richard Bull - Environment Agency
805665	Jamie Sullivan - Tetlow King Planning - RP Planning Consortium
838593	Malcolm Watt - Cotswolds Conservation Board (AONB)