

**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 20: Density/Diversity

Question 1: Is there sufficient detail contained in policy CS16 to clarify the Council's approach to housing density?

- 1.86 As set out in our previous representations, **Policy CS16** should provide further guidance with respect to the different density ranges that might apply in different parts of the Core Strategy area. This text should recognise that flexibility will always be needed and all contextual and policy considerations will influence the optimum density (and an effective and efficient use of land) in each individual case. This could be within the policy itself or the supporting text.

Question 2: How crucial is viability in determining the mix of housing to be provided on a site and is it essential to reference this as factor when considering development proposals?

- 1.87 The amended policy wording is supported, in so far as it has removed the reference to an average density (40dph) across the plan area. Seeking to secure efficient use of land, whilst taking into account location, but also the Council's design objectives and housing mix is logical. The policy, however, should also make reference to the overall viability of development, as this is a critical element of determining the overall density which is appropriate at a particular site (and on larger sites within different parts of that site).
- 1.88 **Policy CS17** (as amended) is broadly supported as it reflects national planning policy (NPPF) and local evidence, in terms of the need to plan for a variety of housing types and sizes to accommodate a range of households. The policy should, however, also make specific reference to the viability of development in informing the overall mix (diversity) of accommodation to be provided, as this is a key element of deliverability (particularly on the large strategic New Neighbourhoods, which the Council relies upon for delivery of the Core Strategy).
- 1.89 It is crucial when considering both density and diversity to consider development viability, as if the density or diversity of housing development is unviable then it will not be brought forward, or will not be able to make expected infrastructure contributions (for example). The NPPF is clear with regard to ensuring viability and deliverability (Paragraph 173.) and this is particularly applicable to this element of the Core Strategy.