

**SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE CORE STRATEGY
– EXAMINATION HEARING**

**STATEMENTS ON BEHALF OF PERSIMMON
HOMES, ASHFIELD LAND AND CHARLTON
ESTATES**

MAY 2012

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Matter 1: Legal Compliance/Procedural Matters	4
Matter 2: Justification – The Evidence Base	6
Matter 3: Spatial Portrait, Issues, Visions and Objectives	8
Matter 4: Sustainability Appraisal	10
Matter 5: Regional Strategy	12
Matter 6: Green Belt	14
Matter 7: Spatial Strategy, Location of Development	18
Matter 8: Provision and Distribution of Housing	22
Matter 9: Filton Airfield	24
Matter 11: Affordable Housing/Rural Exception Sites/Extra Care Housing	27
Matter 12: Gypsy and Traveller Provision – Policies CS21 & CS22	29
Matter 14: Strategic Transport and Accessibility	30
Matter 16: Infrastructure and Developer Contributions	34
Matter 17: Green and Community Infrastructure & Cultural Activities, Sport & Recreation	35
Matter 18: Renewables	36
Matter 19: Design	37
Matter 20: Density/Diversity	38

ID No. 4032065

24 May 2012

TA Ref: PERA2009
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, Ashfield Land and Charlton Estates, who control land at Wyck Beck Road/Fishpool Hill which is part of the proposed Cribbs/Patchway New Neighbourhood.
- 1.2 Representations to the Draft Core Strategy (and subsequent proposed changes) were previously submitted by Turley Associates on behalf of Persimmon Homes and Ashfield Land. Turley Associates are instructed to progress these representations at this Examination.
- 1.3 Persimmon Homes, Ashfield Land and Charlton Estates will shortly (prior to the Examination hearings) be submitting a planning application for up to 1,100 dwellings, on land at Wyck Beck Road/Fishpool Hill. This development is an important early phase of the New Neighbourhood proposals, provides a primary means of access into the wider development site and it is important to make progress now to ensure the timely delivery of housing required in the local area to meet sustainable development objectives.
- 1.4 The following Statements provide our initial comments based on 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 9 – Filton Airfield
 - Matter 11 – Affordable/Rural Exception Sites/Extra Care Housing
 - Matter 12: Gypsy and Traveller Provision (see separate response submitted by Turley Associates)
 - Matter 14: Strategic Transport and Accessibility

24 May 2012

- 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

1.5 These representations will be elaborated further at the relevant Examination hearings.

Matter 16: Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

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

- 1.74 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**.
- 1.75 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?

- 1.76 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.