

We share the views of the Brimsham Park Campaign, in particular that:

“ This change would mean that most of the services required would already be available close to the airfield. It would place modern homes adjacent to the industry reducing the need to commute for local workers and hence address the areas significant environmental pollution. The new homes would improve the appearance of the area, if designed correctly, increasing the value and facilities available to the populations of Patchway and Filton.

This change of location would allow the industry and services in Yate to grow more organically focussing on providing more local jobs to reduce the need for travel. The local services and facilities would then grow to meet the needs of the existing, local, working population. This would lead to more slower sustainable expansion in 10-15 years time, if this was required by the local population.

This Change of location of the 3000 houses proposed for Yate to Filton Airfield should be presented” – as substitution for not in addition to a Yate allocation.”

Yate Town Council objects to the including of Filton Airfield as an ADDITIONAL site, and have argued strongly in our earlier submission that it should be INSTEAD of North Yate new neighbourhood - the Filton site offering a much more sustainable solution in terms of proximity to school, employment retail, hospital and other facilities - compared to North Yate which is trans-green belt, has poor transport and highway links, which are so intractable the plan offers no solution.

We do not consider sufficient attention has been paid to the cumulative effects of the various housing allocations, and their impact on commuter and other travel flows, but particularly on commuter travel flows and the congestion hotspots identified by the Council. No mapping of the cumulative impacts of the allocations has been carried out. The sum of all these impacts is particularly important when the new Filton Airfield development lies between the nearest hospital (Southmead) and Yate, and lies at the heart of the zone that the most commuter journeys from Yate have to get through in the rush hour - so we pour into that same zone the Yate and Cribbs/Filton development. This does not make sens

Given the close proximity of this site to employment, retail and education facilities at all levels, the site meets the Core Objectives of the Strategy and the Council's Community Sustainability Strategy much more effectively than land at Yate.

No case has been made for needing MORE development than the amount originally envisaged, so this should have been done in substitution for other sites not in

addition to. We believe of all the other sites, the least sustainable is the trans green belt allocation of 3000 houses at Yate which should therefore have been deleted from the plan when this land was added.

The arguments that have been put by South Gloucestershire in favour of adding the Filton Airfield allocation, as offering a sustainable community, when applied to the North Yate new neighbourhood, make quite clear that North Yate is NOT sustainable.

We strongly believe for a host of sustainability reasons, that this revision should delete the development proposed at Yate.