

Further Consultation on the Inspector's Further Main Modifications to the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy April 2013

My initial thought was: "here we go again, another 'Consultation' which will be ignored – what a complete waste of time".

Then I thought that a waste of time it may be, but hey it is my 'democratic' entitlement to at least have my contribution recorded for posterity so that the serious flaws that still exist and appear to now be endorsed by the independent Inspector will be seen for what they are in future years. Our future ability to do anything about these decisions are about to be consigned into oblivion and 'Joe public' is powerless to make the decision makers see sense before it is too late.

We have 'lost' over everything else (including the airfield at Filton) and my (and others such as Bristol City Council) previous representations re the Green Belt between the M5 and the A4018 have been overridden.

I wish to record my exasperation and dismay that both South Gloucestershire Council **AND** the Inspector now want to preserve their precious Green Belt elsewhere in their Green and Pleasant County except where green open space is desperately needed viz South of the M4. as well as stick to the wholly unsound decision regarding housing numbers, based on out of date evidence

For the record I will briefly restate my objection to one example among many namely CS5 ref: Policy **CS5 Page Appendix B3/B4 item 6 - extent of Green Belt and Para 6.5 & 6.6** referring to loss of Green Belt adjacent to the A4018 (as well as East of Harry Stoke) on the grounds that, **in the case of the land between the M5 and the A4018 it's development for housing:-**

- 1 Harms the environmental well being** of existing residents in the City of Bristol and spoils a piece of land which forms an natural picturesque backdrop to the approach to the City of Bristol
- 2 Removes existing sporting facilities** (rugby grounds) causing relocation to even further afield from the main users (the residents of Bristol) and subsequent increased travelling distances to any prospective replacement sites.
- 3 Vague public transport mitigation** (of dubious value) of road traffic into Bristol along the A4018, already known to be near to reasonable capacity inside the City of Bristol boundary through places such as Henbury, Southmead and Westbury on Trym.

A recent report has reveals that Bristol is the second most congested City in the UK. What madness it that a new Neighborhood is planned just to the north of the City limits – including relying on the A4018 for all access to it that will massively contribute to the problem?

- 4 No requirement for use as housing** because the housing forecast is based on unsound evidence (based on out of date figures).

- 5 It beggars belief** that both the Council and the Inspector can think seriously that a cohesive new Neighborhood can be created when a main dual carriageway divides the two halves (i.e. the part on the Green Belt land and the remainder to the east of the A4018) Also, where are the local shops etc to be sited that will serve the part on the Green Belt?

I have come to the conclusion that sense has completely gone out of the window on the inclusion of this part of the Core Strategy (i.e. CS5 and the sacrifice of the two remaining small parcels of Green Belt south of the M4) and that the County has split opinion into two. I can only hope in the not too near future, Boundary changes (where the northern fringe is taken into the City of Bristol where I firmly believe it rightfully belongs) will reverse this very bad part of the Core Strategy.

David Roake