

**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	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Matter 19: Design	2
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 19: Design

Question 1: Is there sufficient emphasis in the CS to reflect the importance placed on design in the Planning Framework?

- 1.5 Yes there is sufficient emphasis placed on Good Design, **Policy CS1** makes clear that development will only be permitted where the highest possible standards of design and site planning are achieved – in this regard it is consistent with the NPPF in attaching great importance to the design of the built environment. Notwithstanding this there remain a number of detailed concerns relating to **Policy CS1** as set out in our previous representations, including with regard to the retention of natural site features, and in perpetuity management regimes.

Question 2: Is the supporting text too prescriptive or is the level of detail useful in setting out the Council's design priorities when assessing planning applications?

- 1.6 The supporting text to **Policy CS1** (and **Policy CS1** itself) is too lengthy and prescriptive. It would be more appropriate for the detail given in the supporting text to be provided in the Policies, Sites and Places DPD and a reviewed South Gloucestershire Design Checklist. Paragraph 58 of the NPPF gives clear guidance in relation to the factors that the government considers contributes to the achievement of good design. The supporting text provides no distinctive or detailed guidance for the achievement (or assessment) of Good Design in South Gloucestershire and should be simplified.

Question 3: Is the Council justified in including reference to targets relating to the Code for Sustainable Homes or other standards where these are a requirement of different regulatory processes?

- 1.7 The Council is not justified in including reference to targets relating to the Code for Sustainable Homes, as it has been confirmed by the Government that it intends to implement the transition to Zero Carbon development through the building regulations. The Council does not have specific local evidence to differentiate (justify) why South Gloucestershire should be different to other areas in following the nationally set timetable for the introduction of Zero Carbon Standards, through the building regulations and other regulatory process which are currently being defined.