

MATTER 22/COMMUNITIES OF THE NORTH FRINGE (11 July 2012)
Representator Nos 2827777 & 320641

Jill Kempshall on behalf of Marilyn Palmer

**MATTER 22 – COMMUNITIES OF THE NORTH FRINGE/
CRIBBS/PATCHWAY / EAST OF HARRY STOKE AND UNIVERSITY OF THE
WEST OF ENGLAND – POLICY CS25, CS26, CS27 & CS28**

Issue 1

Is it feasible to accommodate the scale of development envisaged in the North Fringe areas without increasing levels of congestion?

Unless a very high proportion of new households choose to prioritise use of public transport, which may itself not have been improved in step with development, there are bound to be increased levels of congestion. However evidence on the realities of trying to use public transport place doubt on the achievability of transport objectives. Recent (May 2012) threats of cuts to bus services to Bradley Stoke, for example (which is a model for the problems suffered by a large South Gloucestershire housing development on the Bristol fringe) indicate how fragile is the sustained provision of public transport in the area. Recent (2012) adverts for property in the ongoing Cheswick Village development suggest that schools and facilities are “a short drive away”. Enthusiasm to use public transport of whatever kind will struggle against such encouragement for car use combined with high transport prices and unreliable service.

Issue 6

Is it realistic to expect the range and type of facilities required can be provided as part of the Cribbs/Patchway New Neighbourhood?

There is little evidence to suggest that such facilities can be provided in the short term and in step with proposed development. Paragraph 2.2 recognises that previous large scale development on the Bristol fringe has not been matched by the provision of “essential” physical and social infrastructure. It took many years for Bradley Stoke with 8500 houses to acquire one secondary and 6 primary schools during a more favourable economic climate, for example. Given the size of the proposed development such a deficit would not meet the sustainability test of the NPPF.

Issue 8

Are proposals for revised Green Belt boundaries both to the west of the A4018 and as part of the East of Harry Stoke New Neighbourhood appropriate?

The NPPF reiterates the purposes of the Green Belt. It is not appropriate to remove these areas which positively fulfil those purposes. The resulting huge area of urban sprawl across North Bristol and the effective removal of most of the historic city's "front garden" on approaches from M5 junction 17 and M32 junction 1, plus the risk to urban regeneration would be contrary to the intentions of the NPPF.

Jill Kempshall on behalf of Marilyn Palmer

APPENDIX

Example of one of several recent communications to CPRE from North Bristol Neighbourhood Partnerships and Amenity Groups, expressing concern about Cross Border Implications of the Core Strategy and lack of consultation with such Groups

Westbury on Trym Neighbourhood Partnership
c/o 68a Coombe Lane
Westbury on Trym
Bristol
BS9 2AY

18th May 2012

Jill Kempshall
Campaign for the Protection of Rural England

Dear Jill

South Gloucestershire Proposed Housing Development at Filton Airfield and Environs

We write on behalf of the Westbury on Trym Neighbourhood Partnership, one of the Wards and Communities in North Bristol that will be affected by this proposed development. We support the actions of CPRE and their involvement in the Hearing Sessions for this Examination by Paul Crysell BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI to determine if the Core Strategy is, justified, effective and consistent with national policy; and request that this letter is incorporated within your submission.

We consider that an Application of this scale as part of a Core Strategy should be rejected on the basis that it is unsustainable, and hence not "effective" and hence fails the proposed test.

Whilst this development will provide profit for the Land Owner and the Developer, and Political Advantage for the Administration in South Gloucestershire; these short term advantages will be overshadowed by the consequential damage and suffering that the development would bestow on the proposed residents and the existing communities in terms of:-

1. Social amenities
2. Social integration
3. Transport infrastructure
4. Educational infrastructure
5. Health Services infrastructure
6. Utilities infrastructure
7. Environmental infrastructure
8. Loss of Green Belt
9. Employment potential

The Core Strategy fails on a number of procedural issues because the Applicant has failed to provide evidence that they have "Consulted" in a meaningful and comprehensive manner with all the Stakeholders with the result that they have:-

1. failed to understand, recognise or appreciate the overall impact of the proposed development
2. dismissed and failed to address many of the issues they were appraised of
3. failed to learn the lessons from their previous Bradley Stoke Development and integrate required solutions
4. failed to take account of the existing social, educational and employment issues in North Bristol
5. failed to take into account the Bristol City Council Core Strategy that will provide additional housing in North Bristol which will strengthen the case that South Gloucestershire Council cannot look to Bristol to provide employment, schooling, health care provision, social services etc for the residents from this development.

In summary we restate that an Application for this scale development as part of a Core Strategy proposal should be dismissed on the basis that it is unsustainable and will create social harm for the proposed residents and the existing communities; as a result of failing to "Consult" in a meaningful and comprehensive way, and then providing a complete and integrated solution to all the social and economic requirements.

Yours truly

David Mayer

D N Mayer
On behalf Westbury on Trym Neighbourhood Partnership