

<p><b>East of Harry Stoke New Neighbourhood SPD Jan 2016</b>  <b>Consultation responses received Dec2015 – Jan 2016</b></p>		
<p><b>Heritage Consultation responses</b></p>	<p><b>Comment</b></p>	<p><b>Proposed change to SPD wording</b></p>
<p><b>Statutory consultee responses</b></p>		
<p><b>Historic England</b>  Need to take account of heritage assets, both designated and undesignated within and beyond the site, with particular reference to the impact on setting, in line with Policy CS9 of the Core Strategy</p>	<p>The SPD acknowledges the potential for heritage assets. The applicants will need to assess any impacts on heritage assets as part of the development management process.</p>	<p>No alteration proposed</p>
<p><b>Natural England</b>  The production of a spatial masterplan will assist in securing strategically important corridors for landscape, for permeability and for habitat.</p> <p>The overarching masterplan needs to be informed by a site wide Great Crested Newt survey to maintain the population and mitigate impacts arising from development. isolation of populations should be avoided. Specific advice is given on the appropriate creation of habitat. Surveys should remain up to date until licences are granted. Suggest the land for Great Crested newt habitat is specifically identified as part of the green infrastructure requirements.</p>	<p>The SPD wording reflects advice received from Natural England and the Council’s ecologist. Further work on mitigation of impacts will be assessed through the development management process</p>	<p>No alteration proposed</p>

<p><b>Highways England</b></p> <p>The development will not impact adversely on the strategic road network. Impacts on M32 J1 and M4 J19 will need careful monitoring as part of any planning application ( the SGTL is key to performance of the strategic road network), a separate TA for the scheme will be needed to assess development composition and layout.</p> <p>Highways England wish to be engaged in the area wide masterplan to ensure comprehensive planning and to ensure that any application is supported by a transport assessment and travel plan. Suggest the need for engagement with the Highways England to identify and mitigate impacts on the strategic road network is included in the text.</p> <p>Suggest the para 3.44 target of a 5 min walk to the majority of residents is more ambitious and applies to all residents.</p>	<p>The SPD wording reflects advice received from Highways Agency and the Council’s Highways officers. Further work on mitigation of impacts will be assessed through the development management process.</p> <p>The developers are currently engaged with Highways England on transport modelling.</p> <p>The SPD wording proposed in respect of walking distances ensures the majority of residents will have access to sustainable forms of transport. The suggested wording will become too onerous and lacks flexibility.</p>	<p>No alteration proposed</p>
<p><b>Winterbourne Parish Council</b></p> <p>Concern over the level of traffic and congestion that will be generated by the development and reservations that the road network can cope with additional volumes of traffic at peak hours.</p>	<p>These comments are noted. These points are reflected in the SPD and can be taken further through the development management process, specifically through the transport assessment, travel</p>	<p>No alteration proposed</p>

<p>Hambrook Lane should not be closed to peak hour traffic</p> <p>Necessary road infrastructure to mitigate impacts of development should be in place prior to development</p> <p>Development should have significant provision of parking to prevent on street parking issues</p> <p>Access to Southmead Hospital, health centres and Bristol city centre using public transport is a key issue</p> <p>Community facilities must be provided as current provision, including schools, health etc is over capacity. Funding to support St Elizabeth Hall from development will benefit the existing community</p> <p>The 3fe primary school needs to be provided early, secondary provision needs careful consideration to accommodate pupils from all the local planned development.</p> <p>Noise reduction measures are needed to offset the noise impacts from major roads, including houses to south of A4174 at Fenbrook Close and Old Glos Road</p> <p>An additional PCSO post would benefit local policing</p>	<p>planning and through negotiations on infrastructure provision. It should be noted that any contributions will need to be CIL compliant.</p>	
<p><b>Landowner/Developer Comments</b></p>		

<p>Please amend map of 10 Hambrook to accurately reflect the Core Strategy CS27 new neighbourhood boundary and access to 10 Hambrook Lane.</p>		<p>Alter map to reflect CS27 Policy map (see attached map at Appendix D)</p>
<p>Welcome additional access and network of streets for access and integration across the site referred to in the SPD</p>		
<p>The landscape north of railway should show a triangular piece of land on the illustrative map to create an effective landscape screen</p>	<p>The framework diagram is illustrative. An additional paragraph to make this clear is set out under para. 1.3</p>	<p>Proposed wording under paragraph 1.3  ‘The SPD contains an illustrative master plan which indicates one way of designing the site. Other masterplans brought forward through the planning process may be equally acceptable, providing they are capable of demonstrating they are compliant with Policy CS27, with particular regard to meeting the requirements of comprehensive development and infrastructure delivery.’</p>
<p>Suggest removing last sentence from para 1.32 ‘Applications that are not able to demonstrate comprehensive development will be refused planning permission’ as this is too onerous</p>	<p>This goes to the heart of ‘comprehensive development’ as set out in Core Strategy policy CS27</p>	<p>No alteration proposed</p>
<p>Support recognition that development which does not frustrate other development parcels may be brought forward. Unclear how this, and infrastructure delivery will be achieved in practice</p>	<p>The SPD sets out the process for delivery in section 4.</p>	<p>No alteration proposed</p>

<p>Suggest the need for a spatial masterplan prepared by developers is unnecessary and should rely on the illustrative framework diagram in the SPD to guide decisions</p>	<p>The framework diagram is illustrative. An additional paragraph to make this clear is set out under para. 1.3</p> <p>The spatial masterplan, whilst not a regulatory element of the planning process provides the developer partners with an opportunity to present their vision of the delivery of the site prior to any development management process beginning. It gives greater certainty about delivery and comprehensive development.</p>	<p>Proposed wording under paragraph 1.3  ‘The SPD contains an illustrative master plan which indicates one way of designing the site. Other masterplans brought forward through the planning process may be equally acceptable, providing they are capable of demonstrating they are compliant with Policy CS27, with particular regard to meeting the requirements of comprehensive development and infrastructure delivery.’</p>
<p>Concern that the SPD fails to recognise the abnormal costs of delivering the site and therefore fails to deliver flexibility eg in retention of on-site features.</p>	<p>It is not the role of the SPD to assume development costs. The SPD does acknowledge potential constraints and issues to be addressed further through the development management process</p>	<p>No alteration proposed</p>
<p>It is disappointing the SPD does not recognise the spatial masterplanning work that has been undertaken over the last 18 months and that this evidence is not included. In particular the illustrative framework plan is outdated and undeliverable. Work by developers on the spatial masterplan is will therefore not be consistent with the SPD. There is a riskSuggest</p>	<p>The framework diagram is illustrative. An additional paragraph to make this clear is set out under para. 1.3</p>	<p>Proposed wording under paragraph 1.3  ‘The SPD contains an illustrative master plan which indicates one way of designing the site. Other masterplans brought forward through the planning process may be equally acceptable, providing they are capable of demonstrating they are compliant with Policy CS27, with particular regard to meeting the requirements of</p>

removal of the illustrative plan from the SPD to prevent confusion.		comprehensive development and infrastructure delivery.
Para 1.24 – it is important to acknowledge that the new neighbourhood cannot rectify existing deficiencies.	The paragraph in the SPD is intended to reflect the current position within the wider area. The point is not to rectify deficiencies elsewhere, but to draw attention to the lack of facilities elsewhere to offset any impacts arising from development, thus requiring infrastructure to be provided from the new neighbourhood on site	No alteration proposed
Environmental health – acknowledge that noise mitigation may impact on the extent of developable land and overall cost of development	The site may be designed and mitigated in several ways. It is not possible at this stage to know what solutions may cost in any detail. The wording does not prevent consideration of costs being raised through the planning process through a viability report.	No alteration proposed
Acknowledge the sort it centre will not be placed on the new development and remove wording ‘the Council may seek contributions towards this facility from new development’	The SPD makes clear the Sort it centre will be placed in the north fringe. The Waste Strategy makes clear the Council’s intentions in this regard. It is appropriate for the council to seek contributions arising from the needs of the new	No alteration proposed

	residents towards this planned facility	
Remove wording 'applications that are not able to demonstrate how comprehensive development will be delivered will be refused planning permission'	This goes to the heart of 'comprehensive development' as set out in Core Strategy policy CS27	No alteration proposed
Para 1.33 – suggest alteration 'indicative' infrastructure and 'These must be compliant with the relevant CIL Regulations and tested through the planning process'	The infrastructure requirements are set out in the Council's Infrastructure plan and other policy documents. They are not indicative. The need to comply with CIL regulations is set out at national level and is not required to repeat this here	No alteration required
Comment on part 2.4 Community facilities – the shortfall of open space requires detailed evidence as per NPPF , to meet the needs of the new population and not to rectify existing deficiencies	The infrastructure requirements have been assembled from evidence that may be tested through the development management process.	No alteration proposed
Pylons – para 2.7 add 'and overall viability for the delivery of the housing development'	Viability issues may be raised by the developer at the development management stage of planning. The SPD clearly recognises the issue of the power lines as a design constraint.	No alteration proposed
Para 3.15 – alter text to include viability and to test infrastructure requirements against CIL Regs via the planning application process	The SPD acknowledges the constraints and infrastructure requirements. Viability testing may	No alteration proposed

	take place through the development management process.	
3.32 – alter text to maintain hedges and trees where practicable and appropriate	This will be determined through master planning and through impact assessment and mitigation at the development management stages	No alteration proposed
The SPD should acknowledge the potential for elements of SW drainage to form part of informal POS in accordance with multifunctional development	Para 2.32 refers to the integration of SUDS with the landscape. The detail of how this occurs and the extent of the impact will be considered through the development management stage of planning	No alteration proposed
3.32 – link PROWS through open space ‘where possible’	PRWO team advise that footpaths should be contained in open space to retain openness and rural feel. This will be further explored through master planning and development management stages. However, the principle should be maintained at this stage	No alteration proposed
3.38 allotments ‘will be considered’ in areas of highest quality land	The SPD acknowledges that the area by the motorway is the highest grade agricultural land which is least likely to be developed because of noise issues. Therefore it is reasonable to	No alteration proposed

	anticipate that allotments can be accommodated here. This will be explored further through master planning and development management	
3.39 – remove word ‘important’ green corridor and use word multifunctional green space to retain flexibility	The word ‘important’ in relation to the green corridor is set out in policy and therefore is appropriate to use here. The SPD wording acknowledges different forms of open space may be placed in the corridor and is flexible.	No alteration proposed
3.310 – consideration to wording should acknowledge the level differences between development and the SGTL. Flexibility is needed to examine these differences	The SPD recognises that landscape rather than built form will be the predominant feature. Only where development has potential to front the road will there be any discussion. This is a matter that may be further addressed through masterplanning and development management process	No alteration proposed
3.314 – no requirement for community open air events. These may take place on other open space. This wording is over prescriptive	The SPD wording acknowledges the potential benefit, it does not require, open space associated with community building.	No alteration proposed
3.318 remove reference to Mulgrove Farm as a focal point in development as this does not	The SPD acknowledges the role played by Mulgrove Farm at present and also the potential for	No alteration proposed

reflect the spatial masterplan prepared by developers. It should be removed for clarity	this to be a feature of new development. This point was acknowledged in Crest's submission to the Core Strategy. The Land scape and Visual Impact Assessment ( LVIA) required for the development management stage of planning will set out the reasons why Mulgrove Farm is proposed for retention, or otherwise.	
3.319 – add wording 'will combine to reduce where possible significant visual impacts'	No qualification is needed. The LVIA will determine the actual mitigation required.	No alteration proposed
3.42 add 'where possible' after sustainable forms of transport'	The paragraph refers to opportunities to maximise the site's connections. The detailed transport analysis and travel plans as part of the development management process will determine what these are	No alteration proposed
3.44 remove the reference to no more than 5 minute walk or 400m walk which exceeds policy objectives and cannot be evidenced and add 'Access to public transport within the development should be within reasonable walking distance'	Highways England supports a more onerous wording that every resident should be within 400m or 5 minute walk. To reduce the wording to 'reasonable walking distance' relaxes the recommendation too far. A balance is needed.	No alteration proposed

3.46 add 'as far as practicable' after first sentence	The qualification is not needed. The practicality will emerge through master planning and development management processes, as part of the planning balance	No alteration proposed
Para 3.48 – remove 'in consideration of their three dimensional impact' in connection with signage	Sins have three dimensions and their visual impact can cumulatively be detrimental. This wording draws attention to manage 'clutter'	No alterations proposed
Para 3.49 alter wording to allow for parking courts where they are needed to create an appropriate street scene	The SPD discourages the use of parking courts, but does not prevent their use. This is consistent with advice in the Council's Parking Strategy	No alterations proposed
Para 3.52 – add wording to address viability in connection with community infrastructure provision	Viability will be addressed through the development management process	No alteration proposed
Para 3.53 – location of centre accessible to all residents for walking & cycling not necessarily achievable	The aim is to provide access to the centre by sustainable means. The SPD is clear that aiming for access by walking and cycling to local facilities is important	No alteration proposed
Paras 3.54-8 – add CIL compliance and viability as matters to be considered when providing facilities	Viability is an issue to be addressed through the development management process. CIL is in national guidance	No alteration proposed

Paras 3.63 – remove wording referring to affordable housing, extra care and provision for gypsies and travellers	This is compliant with Core Strategy policy fro mixed and balanced communities	No alteration proposed
Para 3.67 – remove paragraph referring to gypsies and traveller provision as unduly onerous	The approach has been used on other strategic sites. Provision for gypsy and travellers is set out in the Core Strategy	No alteration proposed
Para 3.68 – remove the reference to food and drink outlets ‘will be provided’ and replace with ‘are anticipated’	The policy CS27 makes specific reference to these facilities being provided within the new neighbourhood.	No alteration proposed
Para 3.616 – remove sentence referring to contemporary interpretation in the use of traditional local building materials, design and public realm	The SPD only encourages this approach. It does not require it. There is flexibility in the wording	No alteration proposed
Para 3.85 remove para on low carbon & renewable energy	There is still an expectation to demonstrate how the developer has addresses these issues in the Core Strategy.	No alteration proposed
3.88 – acknowledge undergrounding the pylons may be a significant cost burden on development	The viability of undergrounding pylons will be tested at the development management stage of planning	No alteration proposed
3.810 – add ‘unless consideration is given to relocation’	Agree	Add ‘ unless consideration is given to relocation’ at the end of the first sentence
3.811 – add viability as an issue here	Viability will be considered through the development management process	No alteration proposed

<p>3.812 – remove paragraph on electric vehicle charging</p>	<p>This paragraph encourages developers to make provision for electric vehicle charging. The wording is sufficiently flexible</p>	<p>No alteration proposed</p>
<p>Climate change adaption – 3.813 after ‘make use of living roofs add ‘where practicable within commercial and school</p> <p>And</p> <p>Remove ‘specification of vegetation’ in bullet 6</p>	<p>The SPD allows for wider consideration eg use on garage roofs etc.</p> <p>Vegetation should be equally robust fro the lifetime of development</p>	<p>No alteration proposed</p>
<p>4.03 remove ‘with infrastructure delivery proposals’ from the first sentence</p> <p>Add ‘as far as is practicable’ to the wording regarding the collaboration of landowners</p>	<p>The spatial masterplan should illustrate the developers’ intentions with regard to infrastructure delivery, to demonstrate where these items may go</p>	<p>No alteration proposed</p>
<p>4.05 – remove reference to renewable energy and utilities strategy from the masterplan</p> <p>Remove ‘proposals fro noise attenuation’</p>	<p>The SPD is seeking some certainty about where and how these matters will be addressed. This may be dealt with through the development management process</p>	<p>No alteration proposed</p>
<p>It is unreasonable to expect all landowners to collaborate in the production of the spatial masterplan</p>	<p>The Core Strategy expects landowners and developers to work collaboratively. The SPD simply follows that policy requirement fro comprehensive delivery</p>	<p>No alteration proposed</p>

Stage 4 – remove reference to design codes	Given the likelihood that different developers will be involved in delivery of the housing allocation a consistent approach to design is sensible. This approach has been followed on all other major sites.	No alteration proposed
Appendix B – all infrastructure requirements must be CIL compliant and referenced to site wide viability. Appendix B should be seen as a wishlist until evidence of these requirements is provided	The infrastructure requirements are identified through the infrastructure delivery plan and each service area is responsible for providing the evidence to substantiate that request. This and any viability issues presented by the applicant will be dealt with through the development management process	No alteration proposed
<b>General Comments Received</b>		
<b>Transport Comments</b>		
Transport assessment and mitigation is required, with particular reference to the A4174 and impacts on UWE and MOD	The scheme will be subject to a Transport Assessment, as set out in the SPD. This will consider traffic impacts and issues/mitigation arising as a result of the development.	No alteration proposed
Hambrook Lane – concern over closure and request to re-open. Concern expressed over access to Elizabeth Hall in Hambrook.	The scheme will be subject to a Transport Assessment, as set out in the SPD. This will consider traffic impacts and	No alteration proposed

	issues/mitiagtion arising as a result of the development.	
Control access from No.10 Hambrook Lane through development to prevent volumes of traffic using this route	The scheme will be subject to a Transport Assessment, as set out in the SPD. This will consider traffic impacts and issues/mitigation arising as a result of the development.	No alteration proposed
Traffic congestion is a real problem in this area	The scheme will be subject to a Transport Assessment, as set out in the SPD. This will consider traffic impacts and issues/mitigation arising as a result of the development.	No alteration proposed
Hambrook conservation area and has no safe crossings for pedestrians. Traffic impact needs to be controlled	The scheme will be subject to a Transport Assessment, as set out in the SPD. This will consider traffic impacts and issues/mitigation arising as a result of the development.	No alteration proposed
Traffic impact assessment should be made public	The scheme will be subject to a Transport Assessment, as set out in the SPD. This will consider traffic impacts and issues/mitigation arising as a result of the development.	No alteration proposed
Bus services need improving	The scheme will be subject to a Transport Assessment, as set out in the SPD. This will consider	No alteration proposed

	traffic impacts and issues/mitigation arising as a result of the development.	
<b>Air Quality</b>		
Air quality in this area is poor. The combined impact of new road and new development will worsen the air quality	The scheme will be subject to a Transport Assessment, as set out in the SPD. This will consider traffic and air quality impacts and issues/mitigation arising as a result of the development.	No alteration proposed
<b>Flood Risk</b>		
Building on a flood plain is unwise – this area is flood zone 3. Planning consent to insist on flood prevention measures	The scheme will be subject to scrutiny by the Environment Agency as well as drainage officers with mitigation proposed to avoid flood risk areas	No alteration proposed
<b>Landscape</b>		
Consider including a city farm	There is no scope in the proposed policy allocation for a city farm.	No alteration proposed
<b>Ecology</b>		
This proposal will have a significant impact on ecology . This will become an urban area	Ecology is referred to in the SPD, with particular reference to European protected species, and this will be considered by Natural England and the Council's ecology	No alteration proposed

	officer at the development management stage of planning. .	
We need wildlife corridors	Ecology is referred to in the SPD, with particular reference to European protected species, and this will be considered by Natural England and the Council's ecology officer at the development management stage of planning. .	No alteration proposed
The water quality of the Hambrook needs to be maintained with no impact from development	Ecology is referred to in the SPD, with particular reference to European protected species, and this will be considered by Natural England and the Council's ecology officer at the development management stage of planning. .	No alteration proposed
Need more habitat and open space in the development beyond people's gardens	Ecology is referred to in the SPD, with particular reference to European protected species, and this will be considered by Natural England and the Council's ecology officer at the development management stage of planning. .	No alteration proposed
Great Crested newt ponds and habitat need to connect. This should not be used as open space	Ecology is referred to in the SPD, with particular reference to European protected species, and this will be considered by Natural England and the Council's ecology	No alteration proposed

	officer at the development management stage of planning. .	
<b>Community Facilities</b>		
Support for provision of community sports facilities in this area.		No alteration proposed
The green space proposed on the M32/M4 is not healthy and will be used by thousands of residents	The 'green space' will perform several functions and there will be different locations fro open space across the site. The quality of provision will be a matter for the master planning and development management stage of planning	No alteration proposed
The proposed open space pushes green space away from existing residents	The 'green space' will perform several functions and there will be different locations fro open space across the site. The quality of provision will be a matter for the master planning and development management stage of planning	No alteration proposed
Play areas need to be imaginatively designed	The SPD makes reference to play.	No alteration proposed
Need to include a pub for community building	The mix of uses in the centre will need to be commercially viable. The mix will be considered at the development management stage of planning	No alteration proposed
<b>Built Form</b>		
Building heights should be 2-3 storeys maximum	The SPD makes reference to storey heights	No alteration proposed

The development is too dense	The density of development will be consistent with that in other areas to make best use of land	No alteration proposed
<b>Pylons</b>		
Pylons should be undergrounded	The undergrounding is a matter for the developer to pursue. The council may only encourage this approach.	No alteration proposed
<b>Officer Requests for further adjustments</b>		
<p>Under the heading of affordable housing provision in Appendix B and in particular where it refers to cluster of no more than 6 units additional wording is suggested;</p> <p>“ On sites of more than 100 total dwellings, clusters may be increased up to a maximum of 12 affordable homes. However, no more than 6 affordable flats using a common entrance will be accepted.</p> <p>Add the “Ten components for the design of housing for older people” highlighted in the HAPPI report.  <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/housing-our-ageing-population-panel-for-innovation">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/housing-our-ageing-population-panel-for-innovation</a></p>	<p>Noted. This adds flexibility to the delivery of the new neighbourhood.</p> <p>Noted. This provides design guidance only and is for reference.</p>	<p>Proposed wording to Appendix B of the SPD under Affordable Housing “On sites of more than 100 total dwellings, clusters may be increased up to a maximum of 12 affordable homes. However, no more than 6 affordable flats using a common entrance will be accepted”.</p> <p>Add the following to Appendix B of the SPD under Extra Care Housing “Developers are guided towards Ten components for the design of housing for older people” highlighted in the HAPPI report.  <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/housing-our-ageing-population-panel-for-innovation">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/housing-our-ageing-population-panel-for-innovation</a></p>

