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1. Introduction, purpose and context

1.1 South Gloucestershire Council is required under current planning regulations to prepare a Consultation Statement to accompany the submission of the Policies, Sites and Places Development Plan Document to the Secretary of State.

1.2 This statement sets out the consultation undertaken on the South Gloucestershire Council's proposed submission version of the Policies, Sites and Places Plan. This is in accordance with Regulation 22 (1) (c) of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (“the 2012 Regulations”).

1.3 This statement sets out how the council published the Proposed Submission Policies, Sites and Places Plan and advertised the opportunities for people to make formal representations to the Inspector about its soundness and legal compliance in accordance with the Council’s adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and the 2012 Regulations. This statement shows that the requirements set out in the SCI and the regulations have been met. It details the main issues raised in the formal responses to the June 2016 Proposed Submission version of the PSP Plan. The Council’s response to these main issues are also set out.

1.4 This document sets out:

i) Compliance with the Council’s adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

ii) A summary of the engagement undertaken at previous stages of the plans production.

iii) A Duty to Co-operate Statement identifying the strategic matters and the key issues that need to be addressed regarding these matters.

iv) The number of representations received, a summary of the main issues raised at Regulation 19 and the Council’s response.
## 2. Consultation overview

2.1 As well as ongoing engagement with stakeholders throughout the plan’s production, the following main stages of consultation have been undertaken during the preparation of the PSP Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 2013</td>
<td>Emails and letters were sent out to everyone on the Council’s e-consult iNovem database (approx 5,000 names) informing them of the start of the Plan's preparation, the purpose of the Plan and the activities that would be undertaken over the initial 6 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2013 – November 2013</td>
<td>A questionnaire was sent out in September 2013 to Parish and Town Councils and the unparished areas with questions on the current planning policy issues facing communities and the development needs of local communities, including a request for proposed Local Green Spaces to be designated due to the special importance to the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2013 – December 2013</td>
<td>Emails and letters were sent out to everyone on the Council's e-consult iNovem database inviting them, in accordance with Regulation 18 of the 2012 Town and Country Planning Regulations, to indicate what should be included in the Plan. South Gloucestershire members and Parish and Town Councils were also included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>A Call for Sites took place in January 2014. Emails and letters were sent out to everyone on the Council's e-consult iNovem database inviting them to identify any sites that should be considered for development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June – August 2014</td>
<td>Consultation on the Draft Plan and another opportunity for Call for Sites to be submitted. Emails and letters were sent out to everyone on the Council's e-consult iNovem database. All documents and consultation material made available online. Hard copies of consultation material were made available in the Councils One Stop Shops, Libraries and Mobile Libraries. Press advertisement. 24 public events held across the district and Parish/Town Councils were encouraged to publicise these events on their websites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2014 – January 2015</td>
<td>Targeted consultation with Parishes who wanted to investigate the possibility for future housing allocations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January – February 2015</td>
<td>Targeted consultation with our Duty to Cooperate contacts in accordance with Regulation 18 on Development Management Policies, including promoters of Wickwar Quarry in respect of PSP22 and 23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May – July 2015</td>
<td>Regulation 19 Consultation (reported as Regulation 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emails and letters were sent out to everyone on the Council’s e-consult iNovem database. All documents and consultation material made available online. Hard copies of consultation material was made available in the Council’s One Stop Shops, Libraries and Mobile Libraries. Press advertisement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June – July 2015 (August deadline for landowners)</th>
<th>Regulation 18 Consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal consultation on Local Green Space Designation - Emails and letters were sent out to everyone on the Council’s e-consult iNovem database. Identified landowners contacted. Specific engagement website. Press release. Consultation events for Ward and Parish Councillors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>November 2015 – January 2016</th>
<th>Regulation 18 Consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An appeal decision relating to a housing site in Charfield (June 2015), concluded that the Council was not able to demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land. Therefore, in line with the NPPF, the housing supply elements of the local plan were deemed out of date. The impact for the March 2015 PSP plan was that it could not be taken forward to examination as drafted. Therefore, the submission of the plan was paused while consultation was undertaken on the challenges and options for addressing the 5 year housing land supply shortfall.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| April 2016 | The Council published a press release detailing its intention that the PSP Plan would not include additional housing allocations. The PSP Plan website was also updated. |

| June 2016 | Council decision to progress with elements of the plan not relating to the allocation of the additional housing sites. Removing from the plan additional (new) housing allocations, amendments to settlement boundaries and any designation of Local Green Spaces with developer interest. Update to the Local Plan Delivery Programme (LPDP, former known as the Local Development Scheme), to reflect the amended scope of the PSP Plan. The LPDP recognises the bringing forward of a New Local Plan, which will replace the adopted Core Strategy and the PSP Plan, in accordance with the emerging Joint Spatial Plan and will make additional housing allocations. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>July-September 2016</th>
<th>Regulation 19 Consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal consultation on the Proposed submission version of the PSP Plan, without the inclusion of the any additional housing allocations. Roll forward of residential/residential mixed uses allocations, from the 2006 adopted local plan, under construction and/or at planning stage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Only the Proposed Submission publication stage is covered by this report. The previous stages of the consultation are described in the following separate reports:

1. **Report of Engagement and Main Issues (June 2016)** Covering periods March 2015 - May 2016 (Document Library ref: SD3a)


2.3 This report also details how the overall consultation meets with the Council’s adopted Statement of Community Involvement, see the next section.
3. Consultation on Conformity with the Council’s Adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)

3.1 The Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) explains how everyone can be involved in the preparation of new planning policy documents and in the consultation on planning applications. The council adopted its SCI in May 2008 and revised it in 2015 (Document Library Ref: PP5).

Specific consultation on Policy Documents

3.2 In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 the Council has met the following requirements as set out in the adopted SCI:

• 7 weeks for representations to be provided (SCI requires a 6 week minimum period), seeking representations by the specified date;
• Provision of copies of documents for inspection at the Council’s principal offices and on the Council’s website;
• Invite of written representations on the plan, sustainability appraisal and supporting evidence; and
• Notifications of bodies (detailed at Appendix 2 of the SCI) of the availability of consultation documents.

A summary of Consultation on the June 2016 Proposed Submission Policies, Sites and Places Plan in accordance with Regulation 19

3.3 This section sets out public consultation that was carried out during the summer of 2016. It outlines the range of consultation and engagement techniques that the Council used to promote the 2016 Proposed Submission PSP Plan during the public consultation period.

3.4 The 2016 Proposed Submission PSP Plan (June 2016) was considered and approved by full Council on June 29th 2016. The formal consultation on the Proposed Plan took place from 21 July – 8 September 2016. The council recognises that the consultation period for the PSP Plan was carried out over the summer holiday period. Although paragraph 3.6 of the adopted SCI states that the council will try not to consult during the summer holidays, it recognises that this cannot be guaranteed. Unfortunately, in order to bring forward the plan in a timely way it was necessary to carry out the consultation as soon as possible. The Council endeavoured to provide advance warning to Town and Parish Councils and Ward Members of the Unparished Areas ahead of the consultation launch and the period of consultation was extended beyond a minimum of a 6 week period to 7 weeks. Any representations received after the close of the consultation have been assessed by the Council and will be put forward to and considered at the discretion of the Inspector.

3.5 On the 29th April 2016 the Council’s PSP Plan webpage was updated and a press release (Appendix 1) issued detailing the intention of bringing forward the Plan without additional housing allocations.

3.6 Consultation Material and Publicity on the June 2016 Proposed Submission Policies, Sites and Places plan

• 12th July 2016 – An email (Appendix 2) was sent to Parish/Town Councils and the unparished areas (copied to all Council Members) to provide advance warning of the Regulation 19 consultation on the PSP plan.
• On 21st July an email/letter (Appendix 3) was sent to everyone on the iNovem consultation database inviting them, in accordance with Regulation 19, 20 and 35 of the 2012 Town and Country Planning Regulations to provide duly made representations on all aspects of the plan.

• An advert was placed in the Bristol Evening Post and the Gloucestershire County Gazette on 21st July 2016 (Appendix 4 and 5). The advert set out the matters that would be covered by the Plan, the closing date of the consultation and where to find further information.

• The PSP Plan web page was updated with details about the 2016 Proposed Submission Plan and how to get involved. The page included a link to an online response version of the plan as well as a representation form, guidance note and statement of representations procedure (Appendix 6 - 8).

• The Council’s consultation website was also updated to include a page specifically on the consultation.

• All documents and the supporting evidence base including the Sustainability Appraisal were available to view in South Gloucestershire libraries and One Stop Shops. A briefing note was provided for the libraries, One Stop Shops and the Council’s Contact Centre (Appendix 9)

• On the 25th July a press release was issued on the Council website’s (Appendix 10) homepage as well as the intranet with details about the 2016 Proposed Submission Plan and a link to the consultation web page.

3.7 In addition to the above SCI requirements, known landowners and leaseholders of Local Green Spaces were also engaged with and site notices were put up on LGS’ proposed for designation. Full details can be viewed in the Local Green Space Designation Topic Paper (Document Library Ref: OS4)
4. Duty to Co-operate Statement

Introduction
4.1 This Statement has been prepared by South Gloucestershire Council in order to outline how the Duty to Co-operate, as now required by Section 33A (1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as introduced through the Localism Act 2011), applies to and has been addressed in the preparation of the Policies, Sites and Places (PSP) Plan.

Legislative and Policy Context
4.2. Section 33A of the planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 contains a duty on local planning authorities and a number of public bodies to co-operate on the preparation of Development Plan Documents (DPDs) “so far as relating to a strategic matter”. “Strategic matter” is defined as:

“sustainable development or use of land that has or would have a significant impact on at least two planning areas, including (in particular) sustainable development or use of land in connection with infrastructure that is strategic and has or would have a significant impact on at least two planning areas”.

4.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advises that “public bodies have a duty to co-operate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries, particularly those which relate to the strategic priorities in paragraph 156”. The strategic priorities set out in paragraph 156 are:

- The homes and jobs needed in the area;
- The provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development;
- The provision of infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat);
- The provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities; and
- Climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape.

4.4 It provides guidance on the necessity for planning authorities to actively participate in joint-working when preparing plans. It also explains that appropriate consultation needs to take place with Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) and Local Nature Partnerships (LNPs) on relevant strategic matters and that collaborative working should occur with private sector bodies, utility and infrastructure providers (para 180).

4.5 The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) confirms the duty to co-operate is not a duty to agree, but that every effort should be made to effectively respond to strategic planning matters. It clarifies the continuous nature of the duty; that it cannot normally be satisfied by consultation alone; and that planning authorities will not be able to retrospectively demonstrate compliance once a plan has been submitted for examination. From a mineral planning perspective, the PPG also acknowledges that active membership of Aggregate Working Parties (AWPs) will help in demonstrating compliance with the duty.
4.6 The public bodies prescribed for the purposes of section 33A(1)(c) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (as amended) are:
- Local Planning Authorities
- Environment Agency
- English Heritage (now Historic England)
- Natural England
- Mayor of London
- Civil Aviation Authority
- Homes and Communities Agency
- Primary Care Trusts
- Office of Rail Regulation
- Transport for London
- Integrated Transport Authorities
- Highway authorities
- Marine Management Organisation
- Local Enterprise Partnerships

**Purpose of the PSP Plan and relationship with the Core Strategy**

4.7 The Core Strategy (adopted December 2013) is the strategic element of the Council’s Local Plan, establishing the requirement for new homes and jobs; the spatial strategy for accommodating it and setting out the Council’s broad policies in relation to the strategic priorities identified by paragraph 156 of the NPPF. The PSP Plan reflects and implements the strategic policies in the Core Strategy, is a subordinate plan to the Core Strategy and sets out the detailed development management policies of the Local Plan. It delivers detailed Development Management policies to be used in determining planning applications and allocates a range of land uses. Strategic sites for predominately residential allocations have been allocated in the Core Strategy.

**Core Strategy and the Duty to Co-operate**

4.8 The Council’s Core Strategy was adopted in December 2013. It was submitted for Examination in March 2011 prior to the duty to co-operate coming into force on 15th November 2011. It has been established by the High Court that the duty to co-operate applies only to the preparation of a Development Plan Document prior to submission and that it cannot be applied retrospectively. Whilst the duty does not apply to the preparation of the Core Strategy the issue was discussed at the Core Strategy Examination. The Council considered and demonstrated that in preparing the Core Strategy it engaged with other local planning authorities constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis in relation to strategic matters in compliance with the Duty to Co-operate.

**PSP Plan: scope of strategic/cross boundary issues**

4.9 As set out above the PSP Plan is principally concerned with establishing the detailed policy framework and other site allocations not addressed by the strategic allocations contained within the Core Strategy. The duty to co-operate, in respect of the PSP Plan, should only therefore be considered against any new or additional strategic cross boundary matter not addressed by the Core Strategy and the engagement undertaken in its preparation in respect of these matters.
4.10 The Council considers that the additional matters addressed by the PSP Plan that may have strategic cross boundary implications are limited. The Council sought views of the prescribed bodies early on in the process of preparing the plan to ask what strategic matters they considered that the Plan may have had. The Council considers the following matters may have strategic cross boundary implications:

- The provision of minerals working sites
- Oldbury New Nuclear Build

**Meeting the Duty to Co-operate in preparing the PSP Plan**

4.9 Whilst strategic issues in the PSP Plan not considered through the preparation of the Core Strategy are limited in scope, the Council has still engaged constructively and actively with relevant prescribed bodies in preparing the Plan. In order to meet the duty to co-operate and ensure that any strategic implications of the issues identified above were adequately considered the Council consulted/engaged with the public bodies prescribed for the purposes of Section 33A(1)(c) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act that it considered could be affected, as well as the specific and general consultation bodies prescribed by the 2012 Regulations.

4.10 Consultation and engagement was undertaken not only through notifying and providing the prescribed bodies with the opportunity to comment at all PSP Plan preparation stages, there was also specific engagement on versions of policies in advance of wider consultations, a number of meetings and regular contact took place during the preparation relating to specific issues with the directly affected public bodies/LPAs and Minerals planning Authorities (MPAs). The table attached as **Appendix 11** outlines the different forms of consultation and engagement that was undertaken generally and more specifically on minerals and the Oldbury New Nuclear Build.

**Overall outcomes**

4.11 The formal consultation on the proposed submission version of the PSP Plan (June 2016), concluded with the following responses from the prescribed bodies in respect of the Duty to cooperate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbouring LPA/MPA:</th>
<th><strong>Bristol City Council</strong> has no comments in relation of the DtC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>At this time, GCC [Gloucestershire County Council]</strong> acknowledge the co-operative activities either carried out and / or supported by SGC in pursuit of the Duty to Co-operate requirements. Officers of both councils have worked particularly closely in the consideration of evolving minerals policy issues, which are deemed relevant strategic matters for plan-making in this locality. GCC has specifically engaged with the development of PSP plan’s policies PSP23 (Mineral Working and Restoration) and PSP24 (Mineral Safeguarding Areas). This has been achieved through discrete policy consultations, officer meetings (also including North Somerset) and on-going participation in the South West Aggregate Working Party (SW AWP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other MPAs:</td>
<td>Oxfordshire County Council, as Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, has no comments to make on this plan, including in particular on policies PSP14, PSP23 and PSP24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>The Environment Agency is satisfied in respect of the policy provisions and supporting text detailed in the Policies, Sites and Places Plan, which together with the adopted Core Strategy and JWCS, provide an appropriate policy framework to safeguard the Agency’s interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>No specific comment on the DTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other prescribed bodies</td>
<td>No response received to the proposed submission version of the Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.12 Therefore South Gloucestershire Council are satisfied that there are no outstanding issues in relation to the duty-to cooperate.
5. Statement under Regulation 22(1)(c) (i-iv)

5.1 The following two reports provide details on engagement and consultation undertaken in compliance with Regulation 18 of the 2012 Regulations:

1. **Report of Engagement and Main Issues (June 2016)** Covering periods March 2015 - May 2016 (Document Library ref: SD3a)


5.2 In accordance with Regulation 22(1)(c) (i-iv) of the 2012 Regulations, these three reports detail:

- Who was invited to make representations
- How they were invited
- Summary of the main issues raised
- How these representations were taken into account

5.3 As the March 2015 Proposed Submission version of the PSP Plan was never submitted, the responses were treated and reported on as if they had been made under regulation 18. The Council prepared and consulted upon a new and complete proposed submission plan under regulation 19/20.
6. Statement under Regulation 22(1)(c) (v-vi)

6.1 Consultation on the Proposed Submission version of the Policies, Sites and Places Plan generated around 530 representations from around 280 respondents.

6.2 The following table provides a summary of the main issues raised in the representations made pursuant to regulation 20 of 2012 Regulations, during the consultation period on the Proposed Submission version of the Policies, Sites and Places Plan (21st July 2016 – 8th September 2016).

6.3 Whilst not a requirement of the 2012 Regulations, in order to assist all parties a response to the main issues has been provided, as has a response to the individual representations made (available separately). Where identified Main Issues in the table below relate to Local Green Space Designation, the non-allocation of additional housing and some retail issues, the Councils response is set out in relevant Topic Papers which accompany the submission of the Plan.
**Main Issues**

The following table provides a summary of the main issues raised in the representations made pursuant to regulation 20 of 'The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, during the consultation period on the Proposed Submission version of the Policies, Sites and Places Plan (21st July 2016 – 8th September 2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Number of reps</th>
<th>Main issues</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General (Reported under ‘Introduction’ to the Plan)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1) A general consensus from the development industry that the plan should contain additional housing allocations to deliver sites against the Core Strategy housing requirement and address the current shortfall in the 5 year Housing Land Supply.</td>
<td>1) See Purpose and Scope of the PSP Plan Topic Paper (Document Library ref OS2) for all main issues relating to housing allocations and the Council’s Response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP1 Local Distinctiveness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1) Question the necessity and operation of the policy.</td>
<td>1) No change. The objective and reason for the policy are clearly set out in the PSPDPD. The suggested amendments are considered unnecessary as it goes without saying that the policy will be considered amongst the suite of applicable policies and applications should comply with the Council’s validation check list, where appropriate will include Design &amp; Access Statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP2 Landscape</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1) Policy is generic to every part of the landscape within South Gloucestershire, and contrary to NPPF - there might be little value to the landscape that requires conservation.</td>
<td>1) Policy updated to reflect the hierarchy of landscape designations: the AONB is subject to the highest level of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conserving a landscape is not necessary or appropriate in all instances and the policy should be amended to reflect National Policy.  

2) Policy should reflect that new development may not conserve the landscape and cause harm, which can be mitigated.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSP3</th>
<th>Trees and Woodland</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>No main issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| PSP4 | Designated Local Green Spaces | 10 | 1) General consensus from the development industry that this policy should not be brought forward until such time as a the council can demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land.  
2) Minor wording changes proposed to improve clarity of the policy.  

Generic space specific main issues have been highlighted under Appendix 2 and within the Local Green Spaces Topic Paper. |
|---|---|---|---|

| PSP5 | Undesignated Open Spaces within Urban Areas and Settlements | 6 | 1) The policy is unnecessary and should be deleted, as it duplicates other policies.  
1) Comments noted, no change required as the policy provides a helpful single point for protecting valued by undesignated open spaces. |
|---|---|---|---|

protection through the NPPF; all other landscapes are locally designated.  

2) Policy updated to include criteria for instances where some harm to the landscape is inevitable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSP6</th>
<th>Onsite Renewable &amp; Low Carbon Energy</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>1) The 20% requirement is not justified and the policy should be re-ordered to promote in-fabric measures first.</th>
<th>1) The policy is updated to better reflect the Energy and Decentralisation Acts / energy hierarchy. Additional evidence also provided in a topic paper (Document Library ref OS5).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSP7</td>
<td>Development in the Green Belt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No main issues</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP8</td>
<td>Residential Amenity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No main issues</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP9</td>
<td>Health Impact Assessments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1) The policy is onerous and seeks to remove responsibility from the Council to developers for consideration of wider health &amp; wellbeing impacts of development.</td>
<td>1) No change. HIAs are a valid tool to assist understand the Health Impacts of major development and design better schemes and outcomes as a consequence when used in a collaborative and positive way. The policy requirements are focused on very major developments and are considered proportionate in relation to the NPPF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP10</td>
<td>Active Travel Routes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No main issues</td>
<td>N/A Individual responses supplied in feedback to individual representations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP11</td>
<td>Transport Impact Management</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1) Standards are too prescriptive and do not allow for flexibility.</td>
<td>1) Suggested Modifications - Standards are intended to be guidelines to inform proposals and transport assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>400 metres to a bus stop is too onerous for rural areas.</td>
<td>2) Suggested Modifications – All distances now moved to supporting text, which also sets out different standards will be considered where justified and supported by evidence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>Generally standards have no evidential basis.</td>
<td>3) No Change Required - Please see PSP 11 Transport Impacts Topic Paper (Document Library ref OS6), for justification and rationale of distance to services and facilities and bus stops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>Standards do not reflect rural area issue.</td>
<td>4) No Change Required – Standards reflect upper limit of walkability appropriate to rural areas Please see PSP 11 Transport Impacts Topic Paper (Document Library ref OS6) for justification and rationale of distance to services and facilities and bus stops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>Approach of PSP10 and 11 fail to balance 3 requirements of NPPF, (social, economic, environmental) and need for case to be considered on its merits.</td>
<td>5) No Change required - All development proposals require balance of three strands of NPPF. This policy is focused on sustainable travel and location of facilities and services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>Criterion 6 of policy does not reflect guidance.</td>
<td>6) Suggested Modification – To reflect severe congestion required by paragraph 32 of NPPF.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PSP12     | Motorway Service Areas and Roadside Facilities | 2    | 1) The policy should be restrictively worded and address biodiversity, visual amenity, pollution.  
2) The policy doesn’t make provision for coach stops. |
|           |             |      | 1) No changes required. The plan must be read as a whole, other considerations addressed through other policies in both the Core Strategy and PSP Plan. Insertion of 'only' inconsistent with the phrasing used throughout.  
2) No changes required - the policy supports the safety and welfare of the road user. |
| PSP13     | Safeguarding Strategic Transport Schemes and Infrastructure | 5    | 1) Thornbury and Yate Towns Council have called strategic transport proposals to be detailed in the plan.  
2) Request for specific safeguarding of rail and bus stations/interchanges. |
|           |             |      | 1&2) Comments noted, no change required. Strategic transport packages are set out in the Core Strategy in accordance with the developments set out in the Core Strategy. The Council, together with the other West of England UAs, has recently launched a new strategic transport vision to go alongside the new Joint Spatial Plan. The New Local Plan will, where necessary, detail any schemes/allocations that require planning policy expression in accordance with the JSP and Joint Transport vision.  
3) No change required, the purpose is to safeguard land for future use. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSP14</th>
<th>Safeguarding Rail Schemes and Infrastructure</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>1) Failure to safeguard rail land, car parking and provide for suitable access improvements.</th>
<th>1) Comments noted, no change required. Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy safeguards all rail track bed and associated land for the continuing use or reuse.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSP15</td>
<td>Park and Ride/Share</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1) Objection to the non-designation of P&amp;R sites (Near to Almondsbury, Falfield, Cribbs Causeway, Longwell Green and north of Bath on the A46).</td>
<td>1) Comments noted, no change required. Consideration of new site options are being progressed through the recent consultation on the new Strategic West of England Transport Vision which is being developed alongside the new West of England Joint Spatial Plan. The New Local Plan for South Gloucestershire will allocate additional land for these new park and ride sites where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP16</td>
<td>Parking Standards</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1) Development industry questioning the inclusion of parking standards as maximum standards were abolished by the secretary of state.</td>
<td>1) Parking standards are justified where there is compelling justification. The justification is as follows, which is included in the suggested changed as supporting text: In support of minimum residential parking standards:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 2001 Census statistics showed that car ownership in South Gloucestershire is approximately 1.4 vehicles per dwelling. In 2011 the census statistics showed that this figure had risen to 1.5 vehicles per dwelling. In 2011, nationally 32.1% of households had 2 or more vehicles, whereas in South Gloucestershire some 44.7% of households had two or more. Conversely, 25.6% of households had no car, but in South Gloucestershire this figure was 13.1%.

Justification for maximum parking standard for non-C3 (dwelling house) uses:

In terms of car use and travel to work, the 2011 census demonstrates that South Gloucestershire has higher levels of employment than the national average (6.4% more) and considerably higher levels of car and van use to travel to work, 12% more than the national average. In addition there are air quality management areas in South Gloucestershire, where the air quality is affected due traffic related pollution.
2) Parking standards should be applied flexibly particularly in locations well served by public transport and where high density developments are being encouraged (e.g. Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhood).

3) The policy fails to provide details of the infrastructure required to support cycle parking.

2) No change required, supporting justification (para 5.68) acknowledges this.

3) The cycle parking infrastructure would vary depending upon scale of the development, but could include showers and changing facilities within a development. Suggested change to the supporting text to address this.

| PSP17 | Heritage Assets and the Historic Environment | 3 | 1) Policy is too wordy and lengthy.  
2) There is lack of distinction between the significance of individual heritage assets.  
3) Element of the policy worded as a negative obligation. | 1-3) Comments noted, policy wording consistent with NPPF. Suggested changes proposed to improve clarity. |
| PSP18 | Statutory Wildlife Sites: European Sites & Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) | 1 | 1) Object to requirement that development directly or indirectly has an adverse effect on a SSSI development will only be acceptable where the benefits of development at that location clearly outweigh the impacts. Should be part of planning balance not in policy. Wider benefits of scheme not limited to a particular site. | 1) No Change Required – Policy consistent with paragraph 118, bullet point 2 of NPPF |
| PSP19 | Wider Biodiversity | 5 | 1) Object to sequential approach to local sites. Which require avoiding damage by locating in less harmful location. Contrary to NPPF. | 1) No Change required – Policy approach consistent with paragraph 118, bullet point 1 of |
| PSP20 | Flood Risk, Surface Water and Watercourse Management | 3 | 1) Object to Policy PSP20 and in particular Criterion (i) - expectation to reduce surface water runoff by providing a minimum 30% betterment to the existing situation. Environment Agency state that Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDs) should meet the 1 in 100-year storm event standard, plus 30% contingency to account for climate change. Rather than relating to betterment, the policy should be expressed in the same terms as set out by the EA in the 'Delivering benefits through evidence: Rainfall runoff management for development (2013) document, as detailed above.  

2) Thornbury Town Council would like requirements placed on council/developers that cumulative impact of development on flood risk where there is a series of development sites. | NPPF. Policy is compliant.  

2) Suggested Modification – to ensure compliance with NPPF and reflect nature of irreplaceable habitats.  

3) Suggested Modification - Supporting text clarify approach, of biodiversity gains on intensive agricultural land where development proposals are suggested. | 1) Suggested Modification - Main policy text and supporting text revised to provide clarity as to approach.  

2) No Change Required - Policy includes requirements possible in so far as current legislation allows in relation to controlling run off and flood risk implications from cumulative developments. |
Paragraph 109 of the Framework states that the Planning System should prevent development causing unacceptable levels of pollution and therefore it is clear that any policy which seeks to avoid any adverse impacts on the environment cannot be framework compliant.

1) No Change Required - Avoiding adverse impacts can assist in preventing development that causes unacceptable levels of pollution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSP21</th>
<th>Environmental Pollution and Impacts</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1) Paragraph 109 of the Framework states that the Planning System should prevent development causing unacceptable levels of pollution and therefore it is clear that any policy which seeks to avoid any adverse impacts on the environment cannot be framework compliant.</th>
<th>1) No Change Required - Avoiding adverse impacts can assist in preventing development that causes unacceptable levels of pollution.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSP22</td>
<td>Unstable Land</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No main issues</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP23</td>
<td>Mineral Working and Restoration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1) The AoS west of Churchwood Quarry should be changed to a 'preferred area' to provide more certainty of the contribution it can make in meeting needs.</td>
<td>1) No change required. While it’s helpful to know that the landowner is willing to see the site developed, no information has been submitted regarding its delivery within the plan period. There has also been no indication from the operator that they intend for the resources in this area to be worked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) Current operators have no intention of reactivating quarrying at Cromhall within lease period and Tortworth Estate responsibility to active tenant means that Cromhall Quarry will not reopen within the plan period.</td>
<td>2) No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP24</td>
<td>Mineral Safeguarding Areas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No main issues</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PSP25 | Hydrocarbon Extraction (inc. Fracking) | 2 | 1) Policy sets out some requirements for the exploration and appraisal stage which are unreasonable given that issues such as flow paths and extent of the reservoir are matters which exploration is trying to identify.  
2) Policy requirements for production do not include important policy considerations. The policy appears to assume that a production site will automatically be acceptable against some criteria as it will have been considered at the exploration and appraisal stage. The site may be a different configuration or indeed it is possible that production may take place from a different site to that used at the exploration and appraisal stage. | 1) Change required to address this issue.  
2) Change required to address this issue. |
|------|--------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| PSP26 | Enterprise Areas                     | 3 | 1) Yate should have its own Enterprise Area – focused on SMEs.  
2) Emersons Green Enterprise Area conflicts with LGS designation – alter Enterprise Area boundary. | 1) No Change Required - Enterprise Areas are agreed with multiple partners, including Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), and supported by significant public transport proposals set out in CS7 of Core Strategy. Existing employment in Yate protected by Core Strategy policies CS12 and CS13. New Local Plan correct place to consider potential for new Enterprise Area.  
2) No change required – LGS designation can exist within Enterprise Areas, making |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSP27</th>
<th>B8 Storage and Distribution Uses</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>No main issues</th>
<th>contribution to high quality spaces and public realm.</th>
<th>N/A Individual responses supplied in feedback to individual representations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSP28</td>
<td>Rural Economy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1) A new policy is needed for market towns which address the needs of the rural areas 2) The policy is too restrictive on rural economic growth.</td>
<td>1&amp;2) No changes are required. Other policies in the Core Strategy and PSP Plan apply to market towns. The policy is considered to be appropriately worded to support suitable rural economic growth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP29</td>
<td>Agricultural Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No representations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP30</td>
<td>Horse Related Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No representations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP31</td>
<td>Town Centre Uses</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1) Object to new threshold for A1 retail impact assessment. Core Strategy already non compliment, no evidence for new threshold. 2) Support 350m² threshold. 3) Would like RIA for A1 to be made explicit that impact assessments are applicable not only to new development but also to changes of use, Section 73 applications and Variations to S106 agreements which may seek amendments to existing Permissions which necessarily restrict the level and type of goods that can be sold.</td>
<td>1) No Change Required - Justification and evidence for approach within Retail Topic Paper (Document Library ref OS3). 2) Support for 350m² Noted 3) Suggested Modification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>Yate can assist meet retail needs post 2021 and welcome contact with council to discuss. Plan fails to meet needs in full post 2021, 18,000 should be allocated to Cribbs Causeway.</td>
<td>4)</td>
<td>No Change Required - Approach to retail need post 2021 set out in Retail Topic Paper (Document Library ref OS3).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>Yate Centre and Frontage should be extended to cover Cranleigh Court Road.</td>
<td>5)</td>
<td>No Change Required – Cranleigh Court Road covered by Local Centre protection in CS14 and PSP32.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>Support stoke Gifford Town Centre boundary, primary shopping area.</td>
<td>6)</td>
<td>Support noted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td>Support increase in floor space at Stoke Gifford.</td>
<td>7)</td>
<td>Support noted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td>AXA site should be included in Primary Shopping Area for Stoke Gifford.</td>
<td>8)</td>
<td>Suggested Modification – Edge of Centre site designated on proposals map.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)</td>
<td>Support general provisions of PSP31, but would like Kingswood floor space raised from 3000 to 4000.</td>
<td>9)</td>
<td>Support Noted – No Change Required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10)</td>
<td>Would like to see Kingswood site allocated to improve certainty of delivery.</td>
<td>10)</td>
<td>Suggested Modification – Site designated on proposals map</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11)</td>
<td>Support for approach from investors and centre owners (Bradley Stoke, Kingswood, Stoke Gifford, AXA site, Yate and Galleries).</td>
<td>11)</td>
<td>Support for distribution of A1 growth and plans for investment Noted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12)</td>
<td>Object to plans for growth of Bradley Stoke due to poor access which will be made worse by Metro Bus (Transport focused comment).</td>
<td>12)</td>
<td>No Change Required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP32</td>
<td>Local Centres, Parades and Facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1) Should be encouraging further development in local centres and parades, which may not be small scale, where that development will contribute to the diversity and vitality of the centre.</td>
<td>1) No Change Required – Policy 31 sets out approach to large scale proposals, PSP32 for local level to meet local need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PSP33 | Shopping Frontages | 3 | 1) Support policy.  
2) Yate Town council detailed comments on where should and should not be frontage.  
3) Yate shopping centre owners, would like resi/office in secondary frontage  
4) Further representation on secondary frontages within Yate to specify where residential would be appropriate in Yate. | 1) Support Noted  
2) Suggested Modification, but no change required at Cranleigh Court Road.  
3) No Change Required – need further detail to make changes, blanket removal of secondary frontage approach not appropriate.  
4) Suggested Modification |
<p>| PSP34 | Public Houses | 2 | 1) Potential that 2 year marketing in some locations overly onerous (Yate). | 1) Suggested Modification – Removed requirement in all Primary Shopping Areas. |
| PSP35 | Food and Drink Uses (including drive through takeaway facilities) | 1 | 1) Removal criteria relating to harmful concentration. | 1) No Change Required, criteria justified and appropriate. |
| PSP36 | Telecommunication Infrastructure | 1 | No main issues | N/A |
| PSP37 | Internal Space and Accessibility | 9 | 1) The requirement is not supported by local needs evidence nor is demonstrated to be viable. | 1) No change. ‘Local’ needs evidence beyond what is being built in an area is not required. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards for Dwellings</th>
<th>Development Within Existing Residential Curtilages, Including Extensions and New Dwellings</th>
<th>No main issues.</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSP38</td>
<td>Residential Conversions, Sub-Divisions and Houses in Multiple Occupation</td>
<td>No main issues</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PSP40                   | Residential Development in the Countryside                                                  | 1) There should be no requirement for replacement dwellings to be of similar scale to the dwelling it is replacing.  
2) See Purpose and Scope of the PSP Plan Topic Paper (Document Library ref OS2) for main issues made in relation to amending settlement boundaries/allowing growth outside settlement boundaries. | 1) No change required, consistent with Core Strategy policies. | |
<p>| PSP41                   | Rural Workers Dwellings                                                                     | 1) No representations received. | N/A |
| PSP42                   | Custom Build Dwellings                                                                      | 1) The requirement for 5% of plots on sites of 100 units or more is not justified and causes practical management issues so slowing housing delivery. | 1) No change. The Government’s objective is to improve diversity of supply which the policy objective achieves. Over 400 people have registered an |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSP43</th>
<th>Private Amenity Space Standards</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>1) The Housing Standards Review does not allow for setting such standards.</th>
<th>1) No change. The HSR was clear that it did not deal with standards ‘beyond the front door’, which remain the preserve of Local Authorities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) The recommended minimum sizes are too blunt a tool and the policy is not flexible enough to allow for different contexts (e.g. high density urban living).</td>
<td>2) Minor change to para 8.67. The policy is clear that the standards are ‘a guide’ and para 8.67 is clear as to when and how the standards may be relaxed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP44</td>
<td>Open Space, Sport and Recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No main issues</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP45</td>
<td>Burial Facilities, including Crematoria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No representations received.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP46</td>
<td>Oldbury New Nuclear Build (NNB)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1) Potential for social, economic, transport, and quality of life impact on the nearest town, Thornbury, are not specifically acknowledged.</td>
<td>1) No change. Horizon’s proposed development strategy is not known at this early stage. PSP46 does commit to the preparation of a Pre-Engagement Position Statement which provides an opportunity to consider more location-specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>Does not include a chapter on transport in particular no reference of the Tytherington Freight Branch line form Yate.</td>
<td>2)</td>
<td>No change. Core Strategy policy CS37 point 3 seeks a robust transport and logistics plan and multi modal solutions and investment. PSP46 paragraph 2 refers to a table below that includes a section on Transport (Access and Movement), and includes specific reference to potential use of the Tytherington line, the Charfield station for worker access and maximising rail based deliveries and worker access.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>PSP fails to acknowledge the ongoing decommissioning process at Oldbury and would benefit from contextualising the process to ensure consistency with CS36 and CS37.</td>
<td>3)</td>
<td>No change. Although future development proposals related to decommissioning may come forward within this site, these will be related to the current consented use. It is not therefore considered necessary that the site need be 'allocated' or 'safeguarded' for decommissioning purposes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>Policy is premature at this early stage in the process.</td>
<td>4)</td>
<td>No change. Given the scale and complexity of a nuclear new build project and the impacts and opportunities it would present, experience at other issues, such as those relating to Thornbury.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sites has demonstrated the importance of having relevant policy to inform pre-application engagement with the developer. Policy PSP 46 is therefore timely and will enable more efficient pre-application engagement.

| PSP47 | Site Allocations and Safeguarding | 13 | 1) Omission of housing sites from this policy.  
2) Add Yate Outdoor Sports Centre to allocations in PSP 47.  
3) Extend scope of UWE stadium allocation to reflect existing outline planning permissions. | 1) See Purpose and Scope of the PSP Plan Topic Paper (Document Library ref OS2).  
2) Suggestion to add Yate Outdoor Sports Centre to policy PSP 47 and Policies Map.  
3) No modification to the plan regarding UWE stadium modification. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 14</td>
<td>Implementation and Monitoring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1) There should be a mechanism in order to keep LGSD up to date.</td>
<td>1) No change, to do so would not be consistent with the NPPF.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Appendix 2 | Designated Local Green Spaces | 270 | 1) Not compliant with the Council’s adopted SCI - Insufficient time to comment on the Plan and consultation carried out over the summer holidays.  
2) Only contacted at the formal consultation stage.  
3) Conflict of interest as the Council is a landowner. | See Local Green Spaces Designation Topic Paper (Document Library ref OS4). |
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Failure to comply with Duty to Co-operate with a Town Council.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No SA was undertaken on LGSD.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Failure to designate spaces conflicts with other policies in the plan, e.g PSP2 – Landscape policy, PSP5 Undesignated Open Spaces policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LGSD list cannot be maintained as no process to review and update new designations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Process has been difficult to follow and respond to and political groups divided, informed late in the process and too short a time to respond timetabled.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Space next to or close to railway level crossings need extra safeguarding considerations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>General comments – public taxes should be used to maintain LGS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Support and objection to spaces, and removal of nomination by nominator, for spaces both proposed and not proposed for designation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mapping and assessment errors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Town Centre Summaries</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>No main issues</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supporting Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal</th>
<th>1) See main issue raised in relation to Appendix 2, relating to the fact that no SA was undertaken for individual spaces to be designated by the policy PSP4: Designated Local Green Spaces.</th>
<th>1) See Local Green Spaces Designation Topic Paper (Document Library ref OS4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Regulation Assessment</td>
<td>1) The HRA should take account of the HRA of the recently adopted Stroud District Local Plan</td>
<td>1) An addendum to the HRA have been prepared (November 2016 HRA Addendum note) – no potential in combination impacts arising, due to no additional housing within the PSP Plan (June 2016).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viability Report</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No representations received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All comments received via the consultation have been assessed and, where appropriate, modifications to the Plan have been suggested. The Suggested Modifications (November 2016) to the Policies Sites and Places Plan Proposed Submission (June 2016) (Document Library ref OS1) will be submitted for consideration as part of the examination process. The suggested modifications are intended to address representations made at the Regulation 19/20 stage, as well as changes suggested through consultation with Council officer.
Appendices

1 - 11
In June, councillors will be making a decision on the next steps for the Policy, Sites and Places (PSP) planning document. Subject to agreement at Policy and Resources Committee and full Council in June, the key change being recommended is that the PSP will not include provision for additional housing allocations. Overall housing numbers for the West of England, including South Gloucestershire’s share, is currently being reviewed as part of the draft Joint Spatial Plan (JSP). The view of expert planning officers is that it would be premature to bring forward the housing allocations as part of the PSP because we are currently working collaboratively with the West of England councils on preparing the JSP. The emphasis of the JSP is on finding sustainable locations for housing and employment across the region up to 2036. Further consultation on the draft JSP is due to take place in September. We will consult later this year and in 2017 on a new South Gloucestershire Local Plan and the intention is that the detailed housing allocations will be included in this plan. The new Local Plan will be completed during 2018. The work to progress the PSP will continue. The proposed revised timetable for submission of the plan for independent examination and adoption can be found on our website at www.southglos.gov.uk/policyssitesandplaces
Appendix 2  Advance warning to Town and Parish Councils and Ward Members of the Unparished Areas

Dear Clerk,

Advance Warning of Formal Public Consultation on the June 2016 Proposed Submission version of the Policies, Sites and Places Plan (PSP Plan) [Regulations 19 and 20 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012].

We are contacting you to provide your Council with advance warning that the period of formal public consultation on the June 2016 Proposed Submission version of the Policies, Sites and Places Plan (PSP Plan) and associated documents. The consultation is anticipated to commence on the 21st July 2016 and end on the 8th September 2016. The statutory regulations require that the consultation period should be for a minimum of 6 weeks. All representations/comments made during this formal public consultation will be forwarded on to the independent Inspector appointed to examine the Plan and consider whether it can be found sound.

Suggested Action

Please ensure your parish councillors have the consideration of this Plan on their agenda for the next meeting which falls after the launch of the consultation. Comments should be provided back to South Gloucestershire Council before the formal consultation period ends. If comments are not made or are received late, your Parish will not have the opportunity for its issues to be considered by the Inspector appointed to examine the Plan.

We will contact you again at the start of the consultation. All consultation material will be available to view on our website at: www.southglos.gov.uk/policies/sitesandplaces.

If you have any questions about this email please do not hesitate to contact us.

Kind Regards,

Strategic Planning Policy and Specialist Advice Team
Dear Sir/Madam

Policies, Sites and Places Plan: Proposed Submission Plan Consultation (June 2016)  
(Regulations 19, 20 and 35 Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012)

Update
The Policies, Sites and Places (PSP) Plan is the final document in completing the up to date Local Plan for South Gloucestershire. It will replace the remaining saved policies in the South Gloucestershire Local Plan (2006) and the Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2002), and should be read alongside the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy (2013) and Joint Waste Core Strategy (2011).

There have been a number of stages of preparation and consultation on the PSP plan, details of which can be found at www.southglos.gov.uk/policiesitesandplaces.

In preparing the Proposed Submission Policies, Sites and Places Plan (June 2016) the Council has taken into account the representations previously submitted, where relevant to the content of the Plan.

As the entire plan is subject to another formal consultation all the representations made on the Plan during the summer 2015 consultation on the Proposed Submission PSP Plan (March 2015) were considered as comments made in respect of Regulation 18, and will not automatically be provided to the Inspector for consideration as part of the Examination.

Therefore, if you wish to make representations in relation to the Proposed Submission Policies, Sites and Places Plan (June 2016) in terms of legal compliance or soundness, you should submit them in accordance with the instructions below.

Policies, Sites and Places Plan: Proposed Submission Plan (June 2016) Consultation
The Council has published the Proposed Submission PSP Plan for a period of formal, statutory consultation, with representations invited for a 7 week period from 21 July until 7.00pm on 8 September 2016. In addition to the PSP Plan, a document setting out the changes to the policies map and a summary of the main issues raised through previous consultations (the Report of Engagement and Main Issues) have also been published. The PSP Plan has also been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal and a Habitat Regulations Assessment.

Responding to the consultation
All representations submitted at this stage should focus on whether the Plan has been prepared in accordance with legal requirements and whether it is ‘sound’. Details of how representations should be made are provided on the consultation web page at www.southglos.gov.uk/PSPpublication.

Proposed submission documents
The proposed submission documents (listed in bold text above) are available to view from 8.45am - 5pm Mondays to Wednesdays and 8.45am - 4.30pm Thursdays and Fridays, at the Council’s One-Stop Shops:

- Thornbury Library, St Mary Street, Thornbury, BS35 2AA
- Yate, Kennedy Way, BS37 4DQ (access via West Walk)
- Kingswood Civic Centre, High Street, Kingswood, BS15 9TR
- Patchway Hub, Rodway Road, Patchway, BS34 5PE

These documents are also available to view at South Gloucestershire Libraries (please refer to www.southglos.gov.uk/libraries for locations and opening times).

Submitting representations
Representations are invited during a 7 week period from 21 July 2016 until 7.00pm on 8 September 2016.
The Council’s preference is that representations be made online, using the Council’s internet based consultation system at www.southglos.gov.uk/PSPpublication. If this is not possible, representations should be submitted using the representations form available online, at one stop shops and from libraries. Representations should only be submitted once i.e. by email or by post. 

Please note that representations made at this stage will be submitted, along with the PSP Plan (and other submission documents) to the Planning Inspector and will be made public.

Local Green Space (LGS) Designation
The Proposed Submission PSP Plan (June 2016) includes a list of Local Green Spaces suitable for designation (see Appendix 2 of the PSP Plan). Detailed information about spaces proposed for designation and those not considered suitable for designation in the PSP Plan is available to view online at the link above.

A map of all the Local Green Spaces proposed for designation is available to view online (at www.southglos.gov.uk/environment-and-planning/planning/planning-local-plans/policies-map/).

You may have been contacted as a landowner or leaseholder of a nominated space. Should you wish to formally comment on a Local Green Space, you should do so now as part of this consultation.

Next steps
Once consultation closes the Council will consider the representations received, then submit the Proposed Submission Plan, changes to the Policies Map, the Sustainability Appraisal and main issues raised as part of the consultation, for examination by the Secretary of State, in accordance with Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

If you would like any further information, please contact the Strategic Planning Policy Team at PlanningLDF@southglos.gov.uk or on 01454 863464.

Yours faithfully

Patrick Conroy
Strategic Planning Policy & Specialist Advice Team Manager

The information collected as part this consultation will also be used by the Council in accordance with the data protection principles in the Data Protection Act 1998. The purposes for collecting this data are: to assist in plan making; and to contact you, if necessary, regarding the planning consultation process. Some of the data may be made public as it will form part of the evidence base used to inform the creation of planning policy documents. The above purposes may require public disclosure of any data received on the representations form, in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000.
Appendix 4 Advert in Bristol Evening Post 21st July 2016

SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE COUNCIL

SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE LOCAL PLAN PROPOSED SUBMISSION: POLICIES, SITES AND PLACES PLAN (PSP PLAN)

South Gloucestershire has published its PSP Plan for formal consultation prior to submission to the Secretary of State for Examination.

The PSP Plan contains a range of policies used to guide the determination of planning applications. It also contains a number of site allocations and designations including Local Green Spaces.

The Plan is accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal, Policies Map Changes document and report of Engagement and Main Issues.

All of the above can be viewed at www.southglos.gov.uk/policiesitesandplaces

Copies of all documents are available at South Gloucestershire One-Stop Shops and libraries.

Making representations

Representations are invited on the Plan until 8th September 2016.

You are invited to make representations on whether the Plan has been prepared in accordance with legal requirements and whether it is "sound". Further guidance on what this means and how to respond can be found on the Council’s website via the address above.

If you have any questions, or would like further information about the consultation, please contact the Strategic Planning Policy and Advice Team at PlanningDf@southglos.gov.uk or on 01454 853444.
Appendix 5 Advert in Gloucestershire County Gazette 21st July 2016

SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE COUNCIL

SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE LOCAL PLAN
PROPOSED SUBMISSION: POLICIES,
SITES AND PLACES PLAN (PSP PLAN)

South Gloucestershire has published its PSP Plan for formal consultation prior to submission to the Secretary of State for Examination.

The PSP Plan contains a range of policies used to guide the determination of planning applications. It also contains a number of site allocations and designations including Local Green Spaces.

The Plan is accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal, Policies Map Changes document and report of Engagement and Main Issues.

All of the above can be viewed at www.southglos.gov.uk/policiesitesandplaces

Copies of all documents are available at South Gloucestershire One Stop Shops and Libraries.

Making representations

Representations are invited on the Plan until 8th September 2016.

You are invited to make representations on whether the Plan has been prepared in accordance with legal requirements and whether it is “sound”. Further guidance on what this means and how to respond can be found on the Council’s website via the address above.

If you have any questions, or would like further information about the consultation, please contact the Strategic Planning Policy and Advice Team at PlanningLDF@southglos.gov.uk or on 01454 863484.
South Gloucestershire Council Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan


The Council is inviting representations on the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Proposed Submission Policies, Sites and Places Plan (PSP Plan). These will be considered by the examining Inspector in the context of the soundness of the Plan.

This is a formal statutory stage. The Government’s Planning Inspectorate will appoint an independent inspector to review the Plan and hear any objections, plus require representations to be made in accordance with the procedures set out on this form. It is important that you read the accompanying guidance notes, supplied with this form, as they provide an explanation for the terminology in some of the questions.

Making Representations

The Council’s preference is that representations be submitted using the online consultation system at www.southglos.gov.uk/PSPpublication.

Alternatively, all representations can be made using the representation form below (which, alongside the consultation material, is available via the Council’s website at www.southglos.gov.uk/PSPpublication and submitted to the Council using the contact details below. All representations must be made in writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email:</th>
<th><a href="mailto:planningLDF@southglos.gov.uk">planningLDF@southglos.gov.uk</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post:</td>
<td>Strategic Planning Policy &amp; Specialist Advice Team Environment and Community Services Department PO Box 299 Civic Centre Bristol BS15 0DR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have any questions regarding this invitation to make representations or would like any further information, please contact the Strategic Planning Policy & Specialist Advice Team on 01454 863464.

Representations should only be submitted once i.e. by email or by post.

All representations must be received by no later than 7.00pm on Thursday 8 September 2016.

Please read the Guidance Note available at: www.southglos.gov.uk/PSPpublication before completing your representation. To ensure the Planning Inspector considers your comments.
Please note that all representations must complete parts one and two of this form.

**PART ONE- YOUR DETAILS**

Please be aware that anonymous forms cannot be included and that in order for you to submit your form you **must** include your details below.

The information collected as part this consultation will also be used by the Council in accordance with the data protection principles in the Data Protection Act 1998. The purposes for collecting this data are: to assist in plan making; and to contact you, if necessary, regarding the planning consultation process. Some of the data may be made public as it will form part of the evidence base used to inform the creation of planning policy documents. The above purposes may require public disclosure of any data received on the response form, in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

Should you wish to make more than one representation, please submit a separate form for each representation in Part Two below clearly stating which section of the document you wish to comment on. *(N.B. You only need to complete Part One (Your Details) once)*

In circumstances where there are individuals/ groups/ organisations who share a similar view as to how the plan should change, it would be helpful if individuals/ groups/ organisations make a single representation. It would also be useful if the group/ organisation state how many people the submission is representing and how the representation was authorised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Details</th>
<th>Your Agent’s Details (If applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference No (if known*):</td>
<td>Reference No (if known*):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: Mr / Mrs / Miss / Ms / Dr / Other:</td>
<td>Title: Mr / Mrs / Miss / Ms / Dr / Other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname:</td>
<td>Surname:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forename:</td>
<td>Forename:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation / Company:</td>
<td>Organisation / Company:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode:</td>
<td>Postcode:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact No:</td>
<td>Contact No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If you have been contacted by post, you will find your reference number at the top of the letter under ‘Our Ref’*
# Part Two - Your Representation

Please use a separate form for each representation made and read the Guidance Note available at: [www.southglos.gov.uk/PSPpublication](http://www.southglos.gov.uk/PSPpublication).

## Q1. To Which Part of the Document Does This Representation Relate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Figure / Map</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please specify which Policy, Paragraph, Table, Figure / Map or other document you are referring to:

## Q2a. Do You Consider the Document is Legally Compliant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Q2b. Do You Consider the Document is Sound?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes, with minor changes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Q3. On What Grounds Do You Consider the Document is Unsound? Is It Because It Is Not:

- Positively Prepared?
- Justified?
- Effective?
- Consistent with National Policy?

## Q4. Please Give Details of Why You Consider the Document Is Not Legally Compliant or Is Unsound. Please Be as Precise as Possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Policies, Sites and Places Plan, make a representation on the Sustainability Appraisal or Habitat Regulation Assessment; please also use this box to set out your representation.

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change. After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.
Q5. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the document legally compliant or sound. Please be as precise as possible.

Your suggested change should have regard to the test you have identified at Q4 above where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the Policies, Sites and Places Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text.

Q6. Do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

- [ ] No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
- [ ] Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

Q7. If you wish to participate, please outline why you feel it is necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Q8. Representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specific address of the following. Please indicate which, if any, of the following you wish to be notified about.

- [ ] the submission of the Plan for independent examination
- [ ] the publication of the recommendations of the independent Inspector
- [ ] the adoption of the Plan

*Please indicate as appropriate*
Thank you for your time to complete and return this representation form.
Please keep a copy for future reference.

All representations must be received by no later than 7.00pm on Thursday 8 September 2016.
South Gloucestershire Council Local Plan: 
 Invitation to make representation under Regulations 19 & 20 of the Town & Country Planning 
 (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 

Guidance notes to accompany the Representation Form for the above invitation to make representations

These notes are intended to assist you to make representations on the ‘proposed submission’ Policies, Sites and Places Plan prior to its submission to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. This is the final stage for submitting representations in respect of the Policies, Sites and Places Plan before its submission for independent examination by a Planning Inspector.

The Inspector will consider the representations received alongside the submitted Policies, Sites and Places Plan before deciding whether the Plan can be adopted by the Council. Representations may be to either support or object on the grounds explained below, and the Representation Form provides for support or objection to be expressed. The purpose of the examination, as detailed in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, is to determine whether the Local Plan is ‘legally compliant’ and ‘sound’. Therefore if you are making a representation about:

- how the Local Plan was prepared in relation to the ‘Duty to Cooperate’, or legal and procedural requirements, this would mean that your concern is whether the Local Plan is legally compliant; and,
- if you don’t think that the content of the document is ‘positively prepared’, ‘justified’, ‘effective’ and ‘consistent with national policy’, then the concern is with the ‘soundness’ of the Local Plan.

**Legal Compliance** A plan is considered legal when it complies with the various regulations that govern how it should be prepared. Key issues the Inspector will look at include:

- Whether it is in the Local Plan Delivery Programme (formerly known as the Local Development Scheme);
- Whether community consultation was carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement;
- Whether the requirements of the relevant Regulations have been followed;
- Whether the appropriate notifications have been made;
- Whether a Sustainability Appraisal assessing social, environmental and economic factors has been completed and made public;
- Whether the document has regard to the Sustainable Community Strategy for the areas it covers; and
- Whether the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate have been met.

If you consider that the Policies, Sites and Places Plan is not legally compliant, your representation should make clear the precise reasons why in relation to the legal and procedural requirements set out above. It is anticipated that the majority of representations will relate to the ‘soundness’ of the Policies, Sites and Places Plan. The Council considers
that the Policies, Sites and Places Plan it intends to submit for examination is sound. The Inspector has to be satisfied that the Local Plan is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

**Soundness**

To be sound a Local Plan should be:

**Positively prepared**

This means that the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;

**Justified**

This means that the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;

**Effective**

This means that the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and

**Consistent with national policy**

This means that the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework. If you wish to make a representation seeking a change to the Policies, Sites and Places Plan you should make clear in what way it is not sound having regard to the four tests set out above. You should support your representation by evidence showing why the Plan should be changed. It will be helpful if you should say precisely how you think it should be changed.

Representations should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/ justify the representation and the suggested change. After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

**Where there are groups who share a common view on how they wish to see a DPD changed, it would be very helpful for that group to send a single representation which represents the view, rather than for a large number of individuals to send in separate representations which repeat the same points. In such cases the group should indicate how many people it is representing and how the representation has been authorised.**

Further detailed guidance on the preparation, publication and examination of Local Plans is provided in National Planning Practice Guidance at http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/localplans/.

If you think the content of the Policies, Sites and Places Plan is not sound because it does not include a policy where it should do, you should consider the following steps before making representations:

- Is the issue with which you are concerned already covered specifically by any national planning policy? If so it does not need to be included.
- Is what you are concerned with already covered by any other policies in the Policies, Sites and Places Plan or is it dealt with, or intended to be dealt with, in another Plan, for example the Core Strategy or the New Local Plan?
• If the policy is not covered elsewhere, in what way is the Policies, Sites and Places Plan unsound without the policy?
• If the Policies, Sites and Places Plan is unsound without the policy, what should the policy say?

The Examination
You should also use the Representation Form to let the authority know if you want to speak to the Inspector at the examination.

The majority of representations will be considered by way of written representations. Written representations are an efficient way for the majority of representations to be dealt with and they carry equal weight to those heard in person by the Inspector. The nature of the examination will depend in part on the extent to which those submitting representations feel that it is necessary to explain their representation to the Inspector in person.

If no-one uses their right to speak to the Inspector, the Inspector may choose to carry out the whole examination using written representations.
Appendix 8 Statement of representation procedure

Statement of Representations Procedure and Availability of Documents
In accordance with Regulations 19, 20 and 35 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

This statement is a formal notice describing the development plan document (DPD), known as the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Proposed Submission: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (PSP Plan)

The subject matter and areas covered
South Gloucestershire Council has published its PSP Plan for formal consultation prior to submission to the Secretary of State for examination by an independent Inspector.

The Policies, Sites and Places Plan (PSP Plan) is the final document in completing the up to date Local Plan for South Gloucestershire. The Development Plan currently comprises the Minerals and Waste Local Plan (adopted 2002), the South Gloucestershire Local Plan (adopted 2006), the Joint Waste Core Strategy (adopted 2011) and the Core Strategy (adopted 2013).

The PSP Plan will replace the Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2002) and the South Gloucestershire Local Plan (2006). It contains a range of development management policies and a number of sites for a variety of land uses. It will be used to guide the determination of planning applications over the plan period, which is to 2027.

The Plan is accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal, a document setting out the changes to the Policies Map and a Main Issues Statement, which together form the proposed submission documents.

All of these documents can be viewed via the Council's website at www.southglos.gov.uk/policies/sitesandplaces.

Submitting representations
Representations are invited on the Plan for a 7 week period from Thursday 21 July 2016 until 7.00pm on Thursday 8 September 2016.

All representations must be received by no later than 7.00pm on Thursday 8 September 2016.

Any representations received after this time will not be considered ‘duly made’ and it will be up to the Inspector’s discretion whether they are taken into consideration through the Examination in Public.

These representations should focus on whether the Plan has been prepared in accordance with legal requirements and whether it is ‘sound’.

Please read the guidance note for further information on how to make representations at this stage. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the 4 Tests of Soundness against which the PSP Plan (a development plan document) will be assessed by the Planning Inspectorate. A sound document will be:

1. Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
2. **Justified** – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;

3. **Effective** – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and

4. **Consistent with national policy** – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The Council’s preference is that representations be made online, using the Council’s internet based consultation system: [www.southglos.gov.uk/PSPpublication](http://www.southglos.gov.uk/PSPpublication).

If this is not possible, representations should be sent, using the representation from provided, to the following:
- By e-mail: PlanningLDF@southglos.gov.uk
- By post: Strategic Planning Policy and Specialist Advice Team, South Gloucestershire Council, Environment and Community Services Department, PO Box 299, Civic Centre, High Street, Kingswood, Bristol, BS15 0DR.

A copy of the representation form and guidance note is also available to download on the Council’s website at [www.southglos.gov.uk/PSPpublication](http://www.southglos.gov.uk/PSPpublication).

**Availability of documents**
The PSP Plan and supporting documents can be viewed online via: [www.southglos.gov.uk/PSPpublication](http://www.southglos.gov.uk/PSPpublication).

Copies of the Proposed Submission documents are available to view from 8.45am - 5pm Mondays to Wednesdays and 8.45am - 4.30pm Thursdays and Fridays, at the following Council One-Stop Shops:
- Thornbury Library, St Mary Street, Thornbury, BS35 2AA
- Yate, Kennedy Way, BS37 4DQ (access via West Walk)
- Kingswood Civic Centre, High Street, Kingswood, BS15 9TR
- Patchway Hub, Rodway Road, Patchway, BS34 5PE

Copies will also be available to view at all South Gloucestershire libraries. A list of all the libraries, including information on opening hours is available on the Council’s website at [www.southglos.gov.uk/libraries](http://www.southglos.gov.uk/libraries).

**Next steps**
Once all representations have been received, the Council will submit its proposed submission version of the Plan, changes to the Policies Map, the Sustainability Appraisal and a summary of the main issues raised as part of the consultation, for examination by the Secretary of State, in accordance with Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

Please note that representations made at this stage will be sent to the Planning Inspector and will be made public.

The information collected as part this consultation will also be used by the Council in accordance with the data protection principles in the Data Protection Act 1998. The purposes for collecting this data are: to assist in plan making; and to contact you, if necessary, regarding the planning consultation process. Some of the data may be made public as it will form part of the evidence base used to inform the creation of planning policy documents. The above purposes may require public disclosure of any data received on the representation form, in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000.
Further information
If you would like any further information, please contact the Strategic Planning Policy Team at PlanningLDF@southglos.gov.uk or alternatively on 01454 863464.
PUBLIC CONSULTATION:
POLICIES, SITES AND PLACES PLAN (PSP PLAN)

To: All Library and One Stop Shop staff
CC: All Customer Services staff, All Contact Centre staff

Dear colleagues

This briefing note is being disseminated to all South Gloucestershire Library and One Stop Shop staff who may receive queries relating to the Policies, Sites and Places (PSP) Plan.

The Policies, Sites and Places Plan, once adopted, will sit alongside the Core Strategy and form part of the Development Plan for South Gloucestershire and will guide future planning decisions in the district.

Following the decision of full Council earlier this year; formal, statutory consultation is now underway on the proposed submission version of the PSP Plan (and supporting documents) and runs until 7.00pm on 8 September 2016. Full details of this consultation can be found at www.southglos.gov.uk/PSPpublication.

Once all representations have been received, the Council will submit its proposed submission version of the Plan, with any changes to the Policies Map, the Sustainability Appraisal and a summary of the main issues raised as part of the consultation, for examination by the Secretary of State.

Please note that representations made at this stage will be sent to the Planning Inspector and will be made public.

Customers have been advised that the PSP Plan, Changes to the Policies Map document, Sustainability Appraisal, and Main Issues Statement are available for inspection at the Council’s One-Stop Shops and Libraries – these will be delivered to you through the internal post.

The consultation period runs from 21 July 2016 until 7.00pm on 8 September 2016.

The Council’s preference is that representations are made online via the address above, but can also be submitted by email or post to the addresses below:

- Email: PlanningLDF@southglos.gov.uk
- Post: Strategic Planning Policy and Specialist Advice Team, South Gloucestershire Council, Environment and Community Services Department, PO Box 299, Civic Centre, High Street, Kingswood, Bristol, BS15 0DR

Further information on how to make comments is available at www.southglos.gov.uk/PSPpublication.

If you have any questions please contact a member of the Strategic Planning Policy & Specialist Advice Team on 01454 863464 or by email to planningLDF@southglos.gov.uk.

Strategic Planning Policy & Specialist Advice Team
Environment and Community Services
Appendix 10 Press release to website

Issue Date: 25/07/2016

Policies, Sites and Places Plan consultation launches

We have published our June 2016 Policies, Sites and Places (PSP) Plan for formal consultation.

Representations are invited on whether the Plan has been prepared in accordance with legal requirements and whether it is ‘sound’, before we submit it to the Secretary of State for examination by an independent Inspector.

The PSP Plan will replace the adopted Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2002) and the South Gloucestershire Local Plan (2006). It will be used, along with the Core Strategy (2013) and Joint Waste Core Strategy, to guide the determination of planning applications over the Plan period, which is to 2027.

The PSP Plan contains a range of policies, site allocations and designations including Local Green Spaces. The Plan is accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal, a document setting out the changes to the Policies Map and a Report of Engagement and Main Issues, which together form the proposed submission documents.

Planning, Transport & Strategic Environment lead member Cllr Colin Hunt said: “We would like to encourage residents to comment on our Policies, Sites and Places Plan before submission to the independent Inspector. It is important that we have up to date policies to determine planning applications against. Within the Plan we are moving to designate over 230 Local Green Spaces across South Gloucestershire.”

All of the proposed submission documents can be viewed on the our website at www.southglos.gov.uk/PSPpublication

In addition, copies of all documents are available to view at the following One Stop Shops: Thornbury Library, St Mary Street, Thornbury, BS35 2AA
Yate, Kennedy Way, BS37 4DQ (access via West Walk)
Kingswood Civic Centre, High Street, Kingswood, BS15 9TR
Patchway Hub, Rodway Road, Patchway, BS34 5PE.
Copies will also be available at all South Gloucestershire libraries. A list of all the libraries, including information on opening hours is available on the our website
www.southglos.gov.uk/libraries

Representations are invited on the Plan for a seven week period from 21 July until 7pm on 8 September.

You are invited to make representations on whether the Plan has been prepared in accordance with legal requirements and whether it is ‘sound’. Further guidance on what this means and how to respond can be found on the Council’s website at www.southglos.gov.uk/PSPpublication

If you have any questions, or would like further information about the consultation, please contact the Strategic Planning Policy Team at PlanningLDF@southglos.gov.uk or alternatively on 01454 863464.

Notes to Editors
The PSP plan purely covers development in South Gloucestershire. Local Green Space designation is a way to provide special protection against development for green areas of particular importance to local communities where they accord with national and local criteria.

ENDS

For media enquiries contact:
Strategic Communications
South Gloucestershire Council
01454 863200
www.southglos.gov.uk
Appendix 11 – A summary of Duty to Cooperate consultation/engagement

Summary of consultation/engagement with public bodies prescribed for the purposes of section 33A(1)(c) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act undertaken in preparing the PSP Plan. Please note this appendix highlights the additional consultation and engagement undertaken over and above the consultation on the preparatory stages (i.e. Draft Plan and Proposed Submission stages) with our Duty to Cooperate consultees.

General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How did the cooperation take place and what issue were considered</th>
<th>Who was involved</th>
<th>Outcome/future actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **April and June 2014 - emails were sent to local planning authorities and public bodies, including those set out in national planning guidance. The purpose of this engagement was to share with them our initial work on the draft development management policies and the draft policy for Oldbury New Nuclear Build and to invite them to answer the following questions relating to the DTC:** | The following local planning authorities and organisations were consulted:  
- Bristol City*  
- Bath and North East Somerset Council*  
- North Somerset Council*  
- Wiltshire Council  
- Somerset County Council*  
- Sedgemoor District Council  
- Mendip District Council  
- West Somerset District Council  
- Taunton Deane Borough Council  
- Gloucestershire County Council*  
- Gloucester City Council  
- Stroud District Council  
- Forest of Dean District Council  
- Monmouthshire County Council  
- Sport England  
- Homes and Communities Agency  
- Environment Agency  
- English Heritage  
- Natural England*  
- Marine Management Organisation*  
- South Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group*  
- Civil Aviation Authority | Nine responses were received from the consultees. Policy PSP 44 (Oldbury New Nuclear Build) is the most cited policy considered to fall under the Duty to Cooperate.  
A schedule summarising the responses received and how these comments have helped inform the emerging Plan has been published on our website: [LINK](#) |
| Cotswold District Council were inadvertently omitted from the DtC list for Oldbury NNB and the development management policies, although they had been contacted at formal consultation stages through iNovem mail outs. An e-mail was sent to them on 18th July informing them of this oversight and that it had been rectified. |

| **November 2014 Officer meeting** | **Bristol City Council (BCC)** | **Outcome:** clarifications being made and aided amendments to the emerging PSP Plan. BCC commented that the issues discussed were areas with potential cross boundary implications and would welcome early engagement of any proposals/policies that have cross boundary implications, but that the points discussed were not covered by the Duty to Cooperate. |

| **Action:** ongoing consultation on future drafts |
**January-March 2015**  
Sharing of Part 1 development management policies

| All Duty to Co-operate contacts | No DtC matters arising.  
| Action: continue engagement at formal stages |

### Minerals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How did the cooperation take place and what issue were considered</th>
<th>Who was involved</th>
<th>Outcome/future actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **January 2015**  
Targeted sharing of emerging policies with our Duty to Cooperate contacts and minerals authorities in respect of emerging minerals policies | Neighbouring/ nearby local authorities (LPAs and MPAs); Bodies prescribed in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 | Responses informed drafting of policy. |
| **February 2015**  
Officer-level meeting. Discussions about plan making progress significant minerals-related development issues across the three authorities; the preparation of and publication of Local Aggregates Assessments (LAAs); and DC action that may aid future policy development. | Gloucestershire County Council (GCC); North Somerset Council (NSC) | Sharing of progression and discussion of site allocations.  
Actions: To explore joint engagement with the mineral industry about future supply strategies across the three authorities. Sharing of strategic minerals issues and to convene future officer-level meetings as / when necessary. |
| **June 2015**  
Letter / email communications involving the chairpersons of the WMAWP and SWAWP in review of proposed new joint strategic policy approach for making provision – particularly from within Gloucestershire / South Gloucestershire, for crushed rock aggregate to order to meet a | South West Aggregate Working Park (SWAWP); West Midlands Aggregate Working Party (WMAWP) | Action: To monitor the emerging WCC policy for making provision for aggregates and any further representations made by the WMAWP on this matter. |
Projected shortfall identified for Worcestershire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officer-level meeting at Gloucestershire County Council offices. Discussion about the response sent to the WMAWP and WCC by GCC and SGC concerning a proposed joint strategic policy approach for making provision for crushed rock aggregates from Worcestershire.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>July 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Targeted sharing of emerging policies with our Duty to Cooperate contacts and minerals authorities in respect of emerging minerals policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open dialogue with colleagues in the Gloucestershire County Council and North Somerset Council minerals team.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oldbury New Nuclear Build

The DtC engagement which has taken place to date has involved workshops in respect of the Oldbury New Nuclear Build and emails on the draft development management policies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How did the cooperation take place</th>
<th>Who was involved</th>
<th>Outcome/future actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friday 11 April 2014</strong>&lt;br&gt;A Duty to Co-operate workshop was held. Invitations were sent to neighbouring authorities, as well as those near to the proposal who are likely to be impacted by the development, including other public bodies set out in the NPPG guidance. The purpose of the workshop was to explain what the council is trying to achieve through the draft policy for the Oldbury New Nuclear Build and the likely impacts and legacy that may arise from a proposed new nuclear power station, whilst providing an opportunity for authorities/organisations to provide us with any information they feel is relevant to their area.</td>
<td>Invitations were sent to the following:&lt;br&gt;Bristol City*&lt;br&gt;Bath and North East Somerset Council*&lt;br&gt;North Somerset Council*&lt;br&gt;Wiltshire Council&lt;br&gt;Somerset County Council*&lt;br&gt;Sedgemoor District Council West&lt;br&gt;Somerset District Council&lt;br&gt;Taunton Deane Borough Council&lt;br&gt;GloUCESTERShIRE County Council&lt;br&gt;Gloucester City Council*&lt;br&gt;Stroud District Council*&lt;br&gt;Forest of Dean District Council&lt;br&gt;Monmouthshire County Council&lt;br&gt;Homes and Communities Agency&lt;br&gt;Environment Agency*&lt;br&gt;English Heritage*&lt;br&gt;Natural England*&lt;br&gt;Marine Management Organisation&lt;br&gt;West of England LEP*&lt;br&gt;South Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group&lt;br&gt;Office of the Rail Regulation&lt;br&gt;NHS Commissioning Board&lt;br&gt;(* attendees at workshop)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Since the workshop, the following were consulted on the draft policy: | Cheltenham Borough Council<br>Newport County Council<br>Civil Aviation Authority<br>Local Nature Partnership<br>Highways Agency | |

<p>| Initial written responses following the workshop have been received from: | Bath and North East Somerset Council,*&lt;br&gt;Gloucester City Council,&lt;br&gt;Stroud District Council,&lt;br&gt;West Somerset Council,&lt;br&gt; | This included a request for further engagement with the Gloucestershire authorities and two |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Meetings and Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th June 2014</td>
<td>South Gloucestershire Officers met with Stroud.</td>
<td>Environment Agency, Highways Agency and English Heritage.</td>
<td>Outcome: Sharing of current policy development and project details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th June 2014</td>
<td>Glos County Officers Workshop Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Action: Continued engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January-February 2015</td>
<td>Sharing of Oldbury new nuclear policy</td>
<td>All Duty to Co-operate contacts</td>
<td>Outcome: Feedback on emerging policy taken into account when completing the formal consultation draft. Action: continue engagement at formal stages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 in accordance with Regulations 19, 20 and 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012
2 in accordance with Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.