

**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	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Matter 17: Green and Community Infrastructure & Cultural Activities, Sport & Recreation	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Matter 18: Renewables	2
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 18: Renewables

Question 1: Is either policy inconsistent with the objectives in the Planning Framework, excessively onerous or likely to place unreasonable requirements on development?

- 1.5 As set out in our previous representations amendments are required to these policies to ensure that proposals are practical and feasible (and in turn do not place unreasonable requirements on development). In common with other policies regard needs to be had to the viability of development. The current requirement for District Heating solutions on all major development sites, in many cases will not be feasible and may in due course become redundant in any event as technical solutions are found to address Zero Carbon requirements in other ways – both **Policies CS3 and CS4** should deliver a flexible framework to secure the objectives of the plan.

Question 2: Is it sensible to provide for district heating networks in smaller schemes when further development may not be forthcoming or where new technology could make provision redundant?

- 1.6 No – the provision of District Heat networks in smaller schemes, or as part of larger schemes where delivery is likely to be phased over the entire plan period is not a sensible approach. District heat may be appropriate in some circumstances, but the Core Strategy should not be prescriptive about this and, as above, should deliver a flexible framework for the delivery of renewables (low carbon technology) as part of new development.
- 1.7 **Policy CS4** should be amended to ensure that overall development viability and the performance of the development in respect of other environmental and sustainability indicators (some of which will not be directly built into the spatial planning process) are fully taken into account. It will not always be viable or desirable for district heating to be utilised, even when such a system is theoretically feasible.