

**SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE CORE STRATEGY
– EXAMINATION HEARING**

**STATEMENTS ON BEHALF OF PERSIMMON
HOMES AND MAXIMUS DEVELOPMENTS**

MAY 2012

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Matter 1: Legal Compliance/Procedural Matters | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Matter 2: Justification – The Evidence Base | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Matter 3: Spatial Portrait, Issues, Visions and Objectives | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Matter 4: Sustainability Appraisal | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Matter 5: Regional Strategy | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Matter 6: Green Belt | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Matter 7: Spatial Strategy, Location of Development | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Matter 8: Provision and Distribution of Housing | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Matter 12: Gypsy and Traveller Provision – Policies CS21 & CS22 | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Matter 16: Infrastructure and Developer Contributions | 2 |
| Matter 17: Green and Community Infrastructure & Cultural Activities, Sport & Recreation | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Matter 18: Renewables | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Matter 19: Design | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Matter 20: Density/Diversity | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Matter 21: Yate and Chipping Sodbury | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Appendices: | |
| Appendix 1 – Community Facility Audit | |

ID No: 4012993

24 May 2012

TA Ref: PERA2019
LPA Ref:
Office Address: 10 Queen Square
Bristol
BS1 4NT
Telephone 0117 989 7000
Date of Issue: May 2012

Introduction

- 1.1 The following Statements have been prepared by Turley Associates on behalf of Persimmon Homes and Maximus Developments, who control land to the east of Chipping Sodbury.
- 1.2 Representations to the Draft Core Strategy (and subsequent proposed changes) were previously submitted on behalf of Persimmon Homes and Maximus Developments. Turley Associates are now instructed to progress these representations at the forthcoming Examination.
- 1.3 The following Statements provide our initial comments based on each of the matters identified by the Inspector for Examination at the respective sessions:
 - Matter 1: Legal Compliance/Procedural Matters
 - Matter 2: Justification – the Evidence Base
 - Matter 3: Spatial Portrait, Issues, Vision & Objectives
 - Matter 4: Sustainability Appraisal
 - Matter 5: Regional Strategy
 - Matter 6: Green Belt
 - Matter 7: Spatial Strategy, Location of Development
 - Matter 8: Provision and Distribution of Housing (see separate joint response submitted by Barton Willmore)
 - Matter 12: Gypsy and Traveller Provision (see separate response submitted by Turley Associates)
 - Matter 16: Infrastructure and Developer Contributions
 - Matter 17: Green and community Infrastructure and Cultural Activities, Sport and Recreation
 - Matter 18: Renewables
 - Matter 19: Design
 - Matter 20: Density/Diversity
 - Matter 21: Yate and Chipping Sodbury
- 1.4 These representations will be elaborated further at the relevant Examination sessions.

Matter 16: Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

Question 1: Is there a need to prioritise developer contributions?

- 1.5 Yes – there will always be a need to prioritise developer contributions, accounting for both essential and desirable elements of infrastructure and the extent to which these support or preclude the delivery of otherwise Sustainable Development. At Paragraph 6.13 the Council identifies the infrastructure, to which development will be required to contribute, but this list is extensive and there should be some differentiation. Some of these items are anticipated to be clarified in relation to the New Neighbourhoods through the suggested SPD's or other mechanisms; however greater clarity about the prioritisation of Infrastructure should be provided within **Policy CS6**.
- 1.6 This should be linked directly to the Council's delivery of CIL, which is currently absent from the detailed wording of **Policy CS6**.

Question 2: Should the policy identify that viability is a factor to be taken into account when identifying infrastructure requirements?

- 1.7 Yes – the policy should identify that development viability will be taken into account when identifying infrastructure requirements, and particularly the contributions required from development (rather than other sources) to deliver this. Paragraph 173 of the NPPF makes it clear that careful attention should be made to viability and costs in plan-making. Paragraph 174 of the NPPF also states that to be appropriate, the cumulative impact of such policies "*should not put implementation of the plan at serious risk, and should facilitate development throughout the economic cycle*". This approach is necessary to future proof the Core Strategy, providing certainty and avoiding the need for reviews.