

South Gloucestershire

# LOCAL PLAN

2018-2036

## Local Plan Prospectus Consultation 2017 - Report of Engagement and Main Issues February 2018

## Introduction, purpose and context

- 1.1 This report has been produced following [consultation on the new South Gloucestershire Local Plan \(2018 – 2036\) Prospectus](#), which ran between 12 January and 23 February 2017. Consultation on the Prospectus was notice of the council's intent to prepare a new Local Plan for the whole administrative area of South Gloucestershire covering the period 2018-2036. Accordingly, it represented the start of the process of engagement required for Local Plan preparation through Regulation 18 (1) of the [Town and Country Planning \(Local Planning\) \(England\) Regulations 2012](#).
- 1.2 The purpose of the Prospectus was to set out the scope, methodology and programme for preparing the new Local Plan. It also introduced and explained the strategic priorities for the area and how the council intends to deliver new development that reflects the vision and aspirations of local communities and the needs of people who live, work and invest in South Gloucestershire. The Prospectus contained a number of questions to facilitate response to the consultation.
- 1.3 Alongside the Prospectus, two topic papers were also published to introduce the council's emerging thinking around; the key priorities and vision for the new Local Plan (Topic paper 1) and the structure and policies for the new Local Plan (Topic paper 2). Consultation comments were also sought on the Sustainable Access Profiles and supporting Sustainable Access Methodology.
- 1.4 The Prospectus also explained the importance of the new Local Plan. This is that:
- The council is required to undertake a review of its Core Strategy to be completed by 2018;
  - Only by having an up to date Local Plan can the council comply with planning law and government guidance thereby ensuring full weight can be given to the local plan when making planning decisions; and
  - It will provide a key policy framework delivery mechanism to take forward the ambition and objectives of the West of England Joint Spatial Plan (JSP) and the West of England Devolution Agreement (March 2016) as well as the plans and programmes of the council and its partners
- 1.5 This report covers how the council has sought participation from communities and stakeholders on this document, which represents the start of the process of preparing the new Local Plan. It also summarises the main issues raised through representations made through this consultation period and how these main issues will be taken into account in preparing the new South Gloucestershire Local Plan.

## **2 Report Structure**

2.1 This report deals with the engagement activities in Part 1 and the main issues raised through this consultation in Part 2.

### Part 1: Report of engagement

- Introduction
- Engagement undertaken as part of the Prospectus (Regulation 18 (1)) consultation January 2017

### Part 2: Report of main issues

- Introduction
- Summary of Main Issues raised through Prospectus (Regulation 18 (1)) consultation January 2017

### Appendices

- Appendix A: Email and letter text
- Appendix B: Text sent to Town and Parish Councils to confirm consultation launch
- Appendix C: Invitation to briefing
- Appendix D: Article in the Gazette 13<sup>th</sup> January 2017
- Appendix E: Text displayed on the planning policy consultations webpage
- Appendix F: Text displayed on the new South Gloucestershire Local Plan (2018-2036) webpage
- Appendix G: Text displayed on the new South Gloucestershire Council Local Plan 2018-2036: Prospectus webpage
- Appendix H: Call for Sites webpage
- Appendix I: Sustainable Access Profiles January 2017

### 3. Part 1: Report of engagement

#### Introduction

- 3.1 This section sets out public consultation that was carried out during the [consultation on the new South Gloucestershire Local Plan \(2018 – 2036\) Prospectus](#). It outlines the range of consultation and engagement techniques that the council used to promote the South Gloucestershire Local Plan (2018-2036) Prospectus during the public consultation period.
- 3.2 The consultation invited representations on the South Gloucestershire Local Plan (2018-2036) Prospectus and whether its scope was wide enough.
- 3.3 Engagement undertaken as part of the Prospectus (Regulation 18 (1)) consultation January 2017
- An email was sent on 16<sup>th</sup> December 2016 to all South Gloucestershire councillors inviting initial comment on the Sustainable Access Profiles prior to the launch of the consultation.
  - An email was sent on the 23<sup>rd</sup> December 2016 to Town and Parish Councils and the unparished areas to provide advance warning of the Prospectus consultation. A copy of the text can be found at Appendix C.
  - The council attended the Town and Parish Forum on the 9<sup>th</sup> January 2017 to explain the new Local Plan Prospectus and upcoming consultation.
  - Full Public Consultation was launched on 12<sup>th</sup> January 2017 in which stakeholders on the council's consultation database were contacted by either email or letter in order to invite comments on the [South Gloucestershire Local Plan Prospectus 2018 – 2036](#). A copy of the text can be found at Appendix A.
  - An email was sent 12<sup>th</sup> January 2017 to Town and Parish Councils and elected ward members advising them that the consultation had been launched. A copy of this email can be found at Appendix B.
  - A press release was published on the 13<sup>th</sup> January 2017 to promote the launch of the consultation. The Gazette Newspaper article can be found at Appendix D
  - The Bristol Post also covered this on the 19<sup>th</sup> January 2017 to promote the Call for Sites consultation.
  - A meeting took place on the 20<sup>th</sup> January 2017 for Town and Parish Councillors to brief them on the new Local Plan Prospectus.
  - This public consultation invited comments in writing via email or letter by 23 February 2017.
- 3.4 Updates were made to South Gloucestershire webpages to publicise the launch of the new South Gloucestershire Local Plan Prospectus 2018 – 2036 consultation.
- The council made updates to the following webpages which outline the nature of the consultation and the timeframes in which the public will be able to comment. The following webpages displayed information regarding the consultation:
    1. Appendix E Current planning policy consultations webpage
    2. Appendix F New South Gloucestershire Local Plan (2018-2036) webpage
  - The council also set up a consultation webpage which outlined the details of the consultation, the timeframes in which the council accepted comments as well as the following documentation to view and facilitate response:

1. The new Local Plan Prospectus (online response version)
2. The new Local Plan Prospectus (PDF version)
3. Topic Paper 1: Key priorities and vision for the new Local Plan
4. Topic Paper 2: Structure and policies for the new Local Plan
5. Response Form

The text on this webpage can be viewed at Appendix G new South Gloucestershire Local Plan 2018-2036: Prospectus

- The Prospectus consultation webpage also had links to the Call for Sites webpage as well as the Sustainable Access Profiles consultation page. These can be found at Appendix H and I below.

#### 4. Part 2: Report of main issues

4.1 This section sets out the main issues raised in response to the consultation on the new South Gloucestershire Local Plan Prospectus (January 2017) and is set out in the order that the consultation questions were set out in the Prospectus document. The questions included in the Prospectus are set out below for information.

Question		See para.
1	We are keen to know what cross boundary strategic matters neighbouring authorities, government agencies etc. would like to engage with us on and which methods of engagement would best suit.	4.5
2	Are the key priorities identified in paragraph 3.8 and in Topic Paper 1 the right key priorities for the South Gloucestershire new Local Plan to tackle up to 2036?	4.13
3	Have you any comments on what should be included in the visions?	4.22
4	Is the draft structure the most appropriate approach?	4.30
5	Do you consider the approach to combining policies and the range of policies identified is appropriate to address the land use issues facing South Gloucestershire?	4.35
6	Are there other policies that are needed to address the land use issues relevant to South Gloucestershire?	4.37
7	As part of this consultation additional sites and evidence supporting their deliverability can be made using the online response form available	N/A – see 4.3
8	Do you have any comments on the methodology used to construct the Sustainable Access Profiles? For example comments on the approach to defining the range of key services and facilities, assessing walking and cycling and public transport access.	4.46
9	Do you have any comments on the findings and detail of individual Sustainable Access Profiles? E.g. are certain key services and facilities included which should not be, or are others missing?	4.55

4.2 All representations received through this consultation, including information submitted in response to the Call for Sites will be available to view on the council's website at [www.southglos.gov.uk/newlocalplan](http://www.southglos.gov.uk/newlocalplan) when the next stage of the Local Plan is published.

4.3 No analysis of Question 7 is provided in this report. Instead, the responses received to this question will be published in the form of an updated Call for Sites document when the next

stage of the Local Plan is published – details of which can be viewed at [www.southglos.gov.uk/callforsites](http://www.southglos.gov.uk/callforsites).

- 4.4 Representations which officers felt were not made in response to the questions above have been included in this report (paragraphs 4.61-4.66) and will be considered in preparing the Plan (or other documents, as appropriate).
- 4.5 All the views expressed through the representations are noted and will inform the next stage of the new Local Plan. This will enable the council to review the production of the Plan, the evidence and make any necessary adjustments that are considered appropriate in the preparation of the new Local Plan consultation document.

**Question 1: We are keen to know what cross boundary strategic matters neighbouring authorities, government agencies etc. would like to engage with us on and which methods of engagement would best suit.**

- 4.6 90 responses were received to this question. Respondents included individuals, landowners/ developers and town/ parish councils. Responses were also received from a number of ‘prescribed bodies’ that fall under the Duty to Co-operate (DtC) as set out in the Localism Act 2011 such as Highways England, Natural England and Historic England, as well as two local neighbouring authorities, Stroud DC and Gloucestershire County Council.

#### Cross-boundary strategic matters

- 4.7 The main cross boundary strategic matters raised through representations related to the following broad issues:

- Transport
- Housing
- Employment (including retail)
- Green Belt

#### 4.8 Transport

- Respondents felt it was important to consider and understand cross-boundary relationships with adjoining authority areas in terms of strategic transport.
- The responses largely centred on the motorway network and associated road network, highlighting particular areas to the north (Stroud and Gloucestershire), especially with regard to highway infrastructure, transport and public transport and facilities.
- The large amount of development in north Bristol was also highlighted as an issue causing impact on the local road/motorway network.

#### 4.9 Housing

- Respondents felt it was important to consider and understand cross-boundary relationships with adjoining authority areas relating to housing, including the supporting infrastructure associated with the new housing i.e. education, health, employment and retail.
- According to one developer, the council cannot rely on Neighbourhood Plans to deliver housing and must therefore make difficult decisions about allocating sites in a variety of locations. Strong and effective local community engagement will be required to achieve this.

- The Bristol East Fringe was also raised as an area where particular cross boundary relationship with Bristol needs to be understood.
- One representation called for a recognition across all authorities that there needs to be a greater spread of housing, not just confined to one third of the overall area, allowing people greater access to affordable homes and employment sites.
- One respondent questioned the ability of Bristol City Council to deliver against its own housing requirement and, should this situation arise, the need for the other neighbouring authorities to have to consider how they take this forward and apportion that need between them.

#### 4.10 Employment (including retail)

- It was considered important to understand cross-boundary relationships with adjoining authority areas in terms of employment and retail. One comment suggested that the West of England UAs should co-ordinate their approach to employment and housing demands.
- In relation to retail policy specifically, in the absence of policy through the JSP, it was considered important that the SGLP includes strategic retail policies.

#### 4.11 Green Belt

- A number of representations considered a Green Belt review across the West of England was necessary and must be undertaken using a standardised/agreed methodology between all UAs.

#### 4.12 Other issues

- A number of other issues considered important included social infrastructure i.e. health and education, the environment i.e. green spaces as well as reference to care for the elderly, minerals, waste and a West of England GTAA.

#### 4.13 Duty to Cooperate (DTC) and engagement

- A high number of the representations felt strongly about the importance of DTC and cross-boundary working between local authorities when dealing with the main strategic issues. A large number of these were also of the opinion that it was integral to the DTC process that it is not simply a West of England relationship, but one that encompasses the wider authorities, in particular Stroud, Gloucestershire and Wiltshire.
- A further point was also raised that the DTC should not just be about local authorities and professional officers/agencies discussing strategic matters, but where they affect local communities, concentrated engagement with town/parish councils and their communities on these strategic matters would also be really useful. Workshops were suggested as an option for doing this.
- Improved relationships with statutory bodies such as the Environment Agency, Highways England etc. was also seen as key to success.
- It was suggested that the council must also engage with stakeholders outside of the scope of the DTC e.g. land owners/developers. Focussed, round table working group discussions were recommended.
- It was considered important that cross-boundary working for the JSP continues to be built upon in an open, pragmatic manner in order to ensure that all of the UA Local Plans are in place to secure the timely delivery of new homes. A concern was raised regarding the Local

Plans currently running to different timetables and North Somerset excluding themselves from the Devolution process.

- One comment suggested that some of the housing and employment requirement will eventually need to be met in adjoining areas, therefore this will require a robust approach to the DtC.
- The need for the authority to take into account any new proposals under the Housing White Paper is noted.

#### **Officer response and how comments have informed the preparation of the Local Plan**

Engaging with our DTC partners and understanding the cross-boundary impacts of new development is an essential element of preparing a 'sound' Local Plan.

Feedback from the Prospectus has been used to prepare the Local Plan Consultation Document as follows:

In terms of transportation, the importance of understanding the impacts of new development on the existing road and motorway network is recognised. These issues will be explored through engagement with our neighbouring authorities and Highways England as we move forward. Part 2 of the Consultation Document covering the Strategic Development Locations summaries the progress made so far, how the JSP and Local Plan Policies will work together and how we will work with communities and partners going forward.

The relationship between housing and jobs within the West of England will be explored in the context of the strategic growth proposed through the JSP. The relationship between South Gloucestershire and its other neighbouring authorities over the impacts of non-strategic growth proposed in the new Local Plan will also need to be explored through DTC engagement.

Preparation of the Local Plan's retail policies will need to be the subject of specific engagement with a range of DTC partners, plus other interested parties as these issues are outside of the scope of the JSP. Part 3 of the Consultation Document identifies which strategic Core Strategy and Policies Sites and Places DPD policies will be replaced with new Local Plan policies, it also states that as strategic policies these will be developed following the outcome of the current round of consultation and progression with the Joint Spatial Plan.

The approach to Green Belt will continue to be subject to discussions between the West of England authorities in preparing the WoE JSP. This approach will then inform our position in drafting the Local Plan.

Other issues raised and considered important included social infrastructure i.e. health and education, the environment i.e. green spaces as well as reference to care for the elderly, minerals, waste and a West of England GTAA. Where appropriate Part 3 of the Consultation Document sets out some specific areas of policy where we are seeking further comments.

We continue to welcome and value the involvement from partners and stakeholders surrounding future DTC engagement and this feedback will be considered by officers in moving forward with the Local Plan.

**Question 2: Are the key priorities identified in paragraph 3.8 and in Topic Paper 1 the right key priorities for the South Gloucestershire new Local Plan to tackle up to 2036?**

4.14 There were 110 responses to this question from individuals, landowners and developers, parish and town councils and interest groups/consultees.

4.15 General comments

- Support for all priorities and cross cutting themes of reducing climate change and health and wellbeing.
- Query whether they are compatible in practice for example on economic and housing growth, climate change and transport where more coherence is required on how they relate to each other.
- More clarity on relationship between jobs and housing as well as reducing inequality by providing access to jobs for all.
- Need to be more focussed and clearly linked to detailed area specific visions and policies which will set out how change will be delivered.
- No evidence on how these priorities are relevant to the specific issues facing SGC.
- Need to be restricted to those things which the Plan has control over.
- Missing priorities – need to maintain supply of aggregates, reduce inequality, avoid good quality agricultural land and prioritise making use of brownfield land.
- Parish and town councils stressed the need for face to face consultation and involvement from local communities.

4.16 Reducing and adapting to climate change

- Wessex water raised the need to include flood risk from groundwater and sewer flooding which will increase pressure on existing systems. Development pressure will need to be managed.

4.17 Maintaining economic prosperity

- Support from parish & town councils and individuals for greater clarity on the need for balance between jobs and housing in all localities to reduce inequality and commuting.
- Support from parish & town councils and individuals for reducing inequality and sustainable economic growth rather than simply economic growth.
- Support for expanding on how town centres can meet retail needs and be regenerated based on up to date evidence.
- One developer suggested that the existing relationship between jobs and housing in the area could not be changed and therefore the focus should be on improving transport links.
- A number of landowners and developers responded that the economic ambition of the JSP was not sufficiently reflected and suggested alternative wording to enhance and encourage rather than simply maintain economic prosperity.
- Owners of the Mall wanted to see specific recognition of the role of the Mall at Cribbs Causeway in this priority.

4.18 Providing housing for all

- Issues were raised by individuals and community groups relating to speculative growth exceeding JSP and local plan housing allocations and the LPAs lack of control over the

timeframe of development. This will undermine the JSP and local plan process for example at Thornbury and risk growth in the wrong places.

- Development industry representatives suggested that the priority should be explicit about the need to meet Objectively Assessed Housing Need and significantly boost housing delivery. There is a need to plan flexibly for contingency/buffer housing sites as well as a portfolio of sites of all sizes (including a significant supply of smaller sites) in order to maintain a 5 year land supply.
- Support from developers, parish and town councils and individuals for identifying sites for new housing both large and small scale including in the rural areas to meet need for new homes. The wording of the priority should clearly reflect the need for growth in the rural areas.
- A number of individual respondents thought that there should be no growth at all in the Green Belt, AONB and open countryside or very limited growth in rural communities. There was also support for maintaining the character of rural settlements and only developing in rural areas with the approval of the local community although the issue of the rural housing crisis was also raised.
- A number of developers/landowners suggested that conservation and Green Belt constraints should be balanced against housing in rural areas and that a Green Belt review was required to identify development locations of all sizes in the rural area.
- There was some support for more housing in urban areas and on brownfield sites but other respondents wanted to avoid overcrowding in urban areas.
- The priority should address all tenures as well as owner occupied. There should be more emphasis on the rental market and the need for a balance of tenures and types of housing, including genuinely affordable housing and housing for older people.

#### 4.19 Successful communities

- Support from individuals and community groups for the need for delivery of appropriate and timely infrastructure to support new development.
- Development industry representatives suggested we should recognise the role new development can play in the support and regeneration of existing communities.
- Yate TC and the SGC Liberal Democrat group agreed with the principle but said it needed more explanation. Successful communities require a range of people with mix of ages and social situation and result from the actions of people not simple geography.
- Individuals and community groups were concerned that speculative development undermines the ability of the LPA to provide for community infrastructure and so local communities cannot cope. Expand priority to justify timing development to ensure new development can be assimilated successfully to ensure community cohesion and ensure that development is refused unless community infrastructure is properly assessed, evidenced and fully mitigated.

#### 4.20 Tackling congestion and improving accessibility

- General support for this key priority including reducing car usage, congestion and journey times by improving both public transport and road links.
- Highways England welcomed recognition that congested and limited public transport options are increasing issues in SGC and that the quality and capacity of physical infrastructure will not meet forecast demand. Imperative that Highways England are involved in the process of determining levels and locations of growth so that concerns

relating to the Strategic Road Network are identified. This will also require collaborative working with the rest of the West of England to identify key issues and infrastructure.

- Highways England were pleased with the content of this priority. It is important as far as possible to reduce car usage. Sustainably located and serviced development will help as will locating employment and housing areas within easily reachable proximity. It is essential that the impacts of economic and housing growth on transport infrastructure are planned for and the required infrastructure delivered in a timely way. Support measures to increase proportion of trips taken by walking and cycling, improving public transport alternatives and cycle storage.
- SGC Liberal Democrats suggested the priority should recognise the role of improved broadband in reducing car journeys and congestion by improving access to home working, and online shopping.
- Residents of Thornbury suggested where town centre car parking is full most of the time no new development should be allowed that is beyond 800 metres (walking distance) from town centre.
- Individuals and community groups commented that development in the north of the district is inherently unsustainable as it is car dependent e.g. Thornbury
- Developers and landowners suggested that the priority should be explicit about the need to provide key strategic infrastructure including what is required and clear direction on how it will delivered including:
  - Reopening Charfield Station
  - Road infrastructure to new Oldbury nuclear build and
  - Extension of MetroBus, new motorway junction and rapid transit to serve major new development at Pucklechurch

#### 4.21 Managing the environment and heritage

- Support from Natural England that the priority appears to recognise the importance of the natural environment.
- Historic England welcomed commitment to the historic environment but considers that the Natural environment and built heritage raise separate issues and challenges and demand a distinct approach so should be discrete priorities.
- The Forest of Avon commented that green infrastructure should be provided to meet people's needs, conserving and enhancing existing green spaces.
- The Woodland Trust Green welcomed the commitment that the scope of the Plan will include 'a clear Strategy for enhancing the Natural Environment.' SG currently has 5.8% woodland cover, with just over 20% of its population having accessible woodland within 500m of where they live (Woodland Indicators by Local Authority 2016). Whilst accessibility is slightly higher than the National average there is great potential to create better woodland cover in the area. The wording on managing the natural environment should be amended to "protecting and enhancing the natural..."
- It was suggested that the priority should recognise the importance of the natural environment and built heritage in community identity and quality of life and that access to parks and green spaces should be safe as well as possible.
- A number of groups and individuals suggested the priority should include the need to protect local food supply and therefore prioritise brownfield sites and lower quality agricultural land and protect high quality brownfield land and that best and most versatile agricultural land (BVM) should have the same status as Green Belt land.

- A number of developers commented that only valuable landscapes should be conserved. The landscape should not be preserved for its own sake.

#### 4.22 Improving Health and well-being

- A developer was not clear of the link between imposing minimum Space Standards and education attainment and learning in this priority.
- Representatives of the Mall at Cribbs Causeway suggested that priority should be amended to 'Improving Health and Well-being and Access to Goods and Services' as access is an important aspect of community wellbeing
- An individual suggested that development of local recreational activities for rural housing needs to be a priority to improve health. Expansion of local footpath network and cycle paths can be used for recreational and sporting activity.
- The Woodland Trust supported this cross cutting theme which should be integrated across all policy areas and strategic decision making.

#### **Officer response and how comments have informed the preparation of the Local Plan**

Identifying the key issues facing the area and objectives to tackle these issues is an essential element of the plan.

The development industry response to this question was focussed on the requirement for the SGLP to meet in full the increased need for housing identified in the JSP in line with national planning policy.

More generally responses showed broad support for identifying a wide range of sites for homes of different types across the district. However, concerns were also raised in relation to potential harm to the countryside and environmental assets, the need for timely and appropriate infrastructure and the relationship between housing and jobs to reduce commuting and inequality as well as objections to development at certain locations. Support was given to regenerating town centres and recognising the more ambitious economic aspirations of the Joint Strategic Plan.

Feedback from the Prospectus has been used to prepare the Local Plan Consultation Document as follows:

The SGLP Consultation Document sets out how the new Plan will meet the strategic need for housing and economic growth identified in the JSP locational strategy. The issues raised above have informed the preparation of the proposed approach to the strategy for development in South Gloucestershire which is set out in Part 2 of the Consultation Document. The Consultation Document focusses on areas where a new approach is proposed: a localities based, regeneration led approach to urban living; delivering the strategic development locations identified through the JSP in consultation with local communities; and options for delivering non-strategic growth in the most appropriate locations. The strategy and policies in the JSP as it progresses to adoption will continue to inform our position in drafting the Local Plan on a range of strategic policies, including housing, employment, the environment, transport and Green Belt.

Broad and more detailed responses to this question were also considered in drafting the key issues and priorities for the new SGLP set out at para 1.32 of the Consultation Document. The policies in the Plan, when taken as a whole, will need to deliver development which benefits new and existing communities and ensure that potential conflicts are resolved.

### Question 3: Have you any comments on what should be included in the visions?

4.23 There were responses to this question from individuals, landowners and developers, parish and town councils, statutory consultees and interest groups

#### 4.24 General comments

- A number of respondents commented that the Core Strategy vision is no longer up to date and so the new SGLP vision will need to reflect the West of England Joint Strategic Plan. New sub areas will be required to reflect the JSP growth areas as well as recognise the needs of the whole district.
- Town & Parish councils and individuals commented that it is still important for the vision to protect the Green Belt and to make sure that housing and employment are located in such a way that people are not having to commute long distances.
- Individuals and representatives of the development industry suggested that the sub areas visions need to recognise and improve links with adjoining areas in South Gloucestershire as well as the wider area.
- Representatives of the development sector suggested that the vision must identify a wide variety of strategic and non -strategic allocations to meet housing need in both urban and rural areas and supported the economic growth ambitions of the vision.
- A development industry respondent supported the principle of urban living but cautioned that urban capacity assumptions in the vision must be realistic and evidenced or development targets will not be reached.
- Stroud District Council commented that:
  - The vision should take account of cross boundary development issues regarding the role of settlements in the north of the Plan area.
  - The overall vision for South Gloucestershire should make reference to its location adjoining rural areas of special landscape character within Stroud District Council, on the South Western edge of the Cotswolds AONB and including the protected environment of the Severn Estuary.
  - The vision should identify how climate change may influence local policy to ensure sustainable development including providing for future national energy needs and resilient communities.
  - The vision should acknowledge the role of the Severn Vale Transport Corridor within the wider geographical area, providing efficient north-south communication links, and provide for improvements to M5 Junction capacity and public transport in association with new development
- A community group suggested that the final visions all need to be specific about the amount of growth which will take place within the plan period
- Representatives of the development industry commented that the vision should be focussed and high level and set out only absolutely critical priorities specific to South Gloucestershire.
- Natural England were pleased to note environmental protection will be in the detailed vision for each part of the district as well as the overall vision.
- Historic England commented that It is vital that the importance of South Gloucestershire's history as reflected in the rich and varied Built and Natural Environment shapes the future direction and form of growth to ensure its identity and cultural heritage is safeguarded and the positive opportunities are recognised both in the overall vision and those for the sub-areas

#### 4.25 Comments on the vision for the North Fringe of Bristol

- Representatives of the Mall at Cribbs Causeway wanted a vision and policy for future role of Mall
- An individual wanted reference to providing more green space, better transport and preventing over development.

#### 4.26 Comments on the vision for the East Fringe of Bristol

- An SGC councillor wanted to include reference to the importance of the Science Park for improving employment opportunities for local communities in the East Fringe including priority neighbourhoods.
- Landowner wanted to add new large scale housing development in the Green Belt between Emersons Green and Pucklechurch to the vision for the East Fringe.
- A representative of a landowner/developer wanted reference to development in the Green Belt east of the existing urban area to provide for local needs and support existing facilities and support improved public transport infrastructure.
- An individual wanted reference to providing more green space, better transport and prevent over development.

#### 4.27 Sevenside

- Natural England welcomed a vision for this area that recognises its importance for internationally significant assemblages of overwintering birds associated with the Severn Estuary (a European and Nationally Designated Site) and which celebrates the space that has been provided for these and other species, alongside the enhanced opportunities that have been provided to allow more people to observe, enjoy and benefit from engaging with nature and wildlife.
- A representative of a landowner/developer commented that the vision for Sevenside should include housing and other complimentary uses and a separate vision for Severn Beach subject to environmental mitigation.

#### 4.28 Yate & Chipping Sodbury

- A SGC councillor, Town & Parish councils of Yate & Dodington and a number of individuals made the following comments on the vision.
  - Protect Green Belt and avoid damaging effects of placing employment and housing in locations that require people to commute through the Green Belt
  - Emphasis on Yate as a destination is at the expense of consideration of the Town's internal needs.
  - Should be explicit about public transport and road access to local facilities and to key centres and employment from Yate and address existing congestion issues.
  - Need to express need to both diversify and increase local employment opportunities
  - Vision should make explicit that the 3,000 dwellings to the north of the Town are the ones currently consented, to avoid ambiguity for Yate
- Individuals and local interest groups also made the following comments.
  - Yate and Chipping Sodbury (Y&CS) have had significant development allocated which has not come forward and is land banked. More should not be allocated for this reason.
  - Unfair distribution of growth across the district with too much in Yate and Thornbury build at Warmley instead.

- Green Belt should be extended north in the East of Chipping Sodbury to protect the flood plain and AONB
- Put a stop to any further development of warehousing and distribution uses (B8 Depots) in the Yate area and instead use available sites adjacent to local motorways.
- A number of individuals were concerned about proposed development east of St Johns Way, Chipping Sodbury (CS) for the following reasons:
  - Serious local flooding issues which could be exacerbated.
  - Impact on CS conservation area
  - Importance of east of the River Frome. Frome Valley Walkway and the many heavily used associated Rights of Way that make this an irreplaceable leisure area for Yate/Sodbury and surrounding areas.
  - CS has already had significant development around Waitrose in recent years.
  - Smaller developments of around 20-30 homes around the edge of CS would be more appropriate than one large development at St Johns way.
  - Concern about maintaining the separate identity of Old Sodbury
- Representatives of the development industry made the following comments:
  - Yate is the most economically important settlement in the District and should be the focus for considerable growth.
  - Engine Common should be included in the vision for Yate and is a suitable location for development
  - Support vision to develop and diversify Yate town centre

#### 4.29 Thornbury

- A SGC councillor, Parish Council and a number of individuals made comments about the vision for Thornbury:
  - Core strategy vision was well meaning and should be repeated in the new Local Plan but in practice Thornbury is changing from a thriving market town to a dormitory town and a vehicle for making up housing numbers across the West of England.
  - Continued rapid growth of executive housing at Thornbury and Buckover is not sustainable. Thornbury has poor transport links, is far from emergency health care and new development proposed on high quality agricultural land.
  - The vision should plan for the cumulative impact of all development to ensure mitigation of any impacts and proper planning.
  - Vision should be limited to what is within the authority's control not utopia which cannot be delivered.
  - Concerned about development being in the vision due to serious local flooding issues which could be exacerbated. Particularly development west of Thornbury
  - Concerned about impact of strategic development west of Thornbury on proposed new nuclear build (NNB) at Oldbury. New development should be further from NNB in preference
  - Improve the balance of new developments to ensure that these support the existing businesses and community, and facilitate sustainable transport modes (such as walking and cycling).
  - Unfair distribution of growth across the district with too much in Yate and Thornbury
- Representatives of the development industry/landowners made the following comments on the vision for Thornbury.
  - Vision needs to recognise the sustainable form and function of the town with respect to its very good accessibility to an extensive range of everyday services, a vibrant town

centre, health services and a range of employment and the importance to a much wider rural hinterland.

- The vision for Thornbury should be for further strategic growth with no upper limit to the amount of future growth (but not at Buckover).
- The Vision should include the future development of land to the east of Thornbury in line with the emerging JSP and plan for the required infrastructure necessary to support the growth of the town.

#### 4.30 Rural Areas of South Gloucestershire

- A SGC councillor, 2 Parish Councils and a number of individuals made comments about what should be in the vision for the rural areas:
  - Important to retain existing distinctive and fragile character of rural settlements and quality of life for existing residents, i.e. villages not towns or suburbs this will be a problem in areas identified for large scale growth in the JSP.
  - Development in the Green Belt should not be part of the vision. Every brownfield site should be developed before any green belt site
  - Quantity of development should be appropriate to settlement e.g. 0.5 hectare or less.
  - Alternative approaches for achieving alternative low cost homes to buy should be covered, including community land trusts which would in many cases be more appropriate than speculative developments.
  - How will SGC give communities a stronger voice in the design of new housing to drive up the quality and character of new development, without going through the process of developing a Neighbourhood Plan?
  - Rural settlements should have defined boundaries and defined levels of future growth detailed in the vision.
  - Managed growth should be included (limited housing expansion to meet local need) and public transport improvement.
  - Importance of rural areas for local food production should be recognised.
  - Vision should be more positive on economic growth to create jobs and prosperity.
  - Importance of rural areas for farming, rural businesses, biodiversity and recreation should be maintained.
  - Welcome a policy to allow elderly people to build a retirement home within residential curtilage even outside development boundaries to provide purpose built dwellings and free up family homes.
  - Development surrounding J14 of the M5 is not sustainable as poor access to services and facilities and transport infrastructure issues.
  - There should not be growth in the following villages
    - Charfield – object to JSP vision for major development
    - Coalpit Heath- object to JSP vision, infrastructure inadequate, does not protect Green Belt, impact of doubling population, lack of employment, flooding, historic mines and need for strategic transport links.
    - Falfield - object to JSP vision, poor access to services and facilities. JSP transport proposals are not sufficient to alter this position.
- A parish council suggested further growth in villages should be considered as follows;
  - % of increase compared to the number of existing houses.
  - Take into account the amount of houses the village has already supplied over the previous 10 years to help the housing stock of SGC. This should include derelict houses/barns which have been brought into housing stock.

- Public transport routes highly inadequate for many rural villages. As now without an improvement, new home owners could feel isolated, thus become vulnerable.
- Access to and from new houses. How many additional vehicles could be accommodated on village roads? Is access to the main 'A' roads, (e.g. A46) safe? Are the main roads in and out of villages suitable for two way flowing traffic and not a single track?
- Parking, there must be enough parking provided for any new houses, as there is little street parking available in many rural villages.
- Access to schools, many rural schools could be full, meaning some villages may not have access to their village school.
- Utilities – does the village have gas mains, appropriate sewage, electricity and other infrastructure?
- Full infrastructure (roads, pavements etc.) required to support any new development.
- Stroud District Council considered that rural visions for settlements should:
  - Identify the contribution of small scale development to meet identified local needs can make to boosting their ability to remain sustainable and thriving communities.
  - Promote the role of small scale local businesses, including farm diversification and low impact tourism related activities in rural areas.
  - Promote opportunities to improve accessibility to jobs, services and facilities together with access to the countryside for leisure and recreation.
  - Prioritise conservation, management and enhancement of distinctive built heritage, landscape and habitats.
- A number of landowners/developers made comments as follows:
  - The vision should focus on delivering affordable housing to meet local needs. Any sequential testing of housing locations should restrict the test to the area in which the affordable housing need originates.
  - The rural area should be divided into separate parts, reflecting its different character and relationships.
  - A realistic approach to where new development can be sustainably provided in rural areas is required.
  - There should be a strong emphasis on the delivery of a range of housing (family housing, Starter Homes, housing for the elderly, affordable housing, etc.) to meet the needs of sustainably located villages in rural areas. Additional housing will have the further benefit of helping to sustain existing services and facilities within these settlements.
  - A Green Belt review should be undertaken to identify suitable land which may be more sustainable than land outside the Green Belt.
  - Visions for specific areas need to recognise/ensure that there will be no conflict with future Mineral Extraction. The Comments on 'Rural Areas' should recognise and accept that Mineral Extraction does and will continue to take place.
  - The emerging JSP Strategy for Charfield is very different to other rural settlements. This requires a complementary Strategic Vision. On the basis of the emerging JSP we suggest that it forms part of a 'Thornbury - Buckover - Junction14 - Charfield' axis as a strategic concept for which the emerging Local Plan should provide a strategic vision, unpacked in respect of the specific locations within it.
  - Various landowners/ developers identified opportunities to promote growth in the following villages
    - Almondsbury
    - Frampton Cotterell

- Hawkesbury Upton (for 12 affordable homes)
- Oldbury on Severn
- Pilning
- Pucklechurch
- Tockington
- Tytherington
- Winterbourne

**Officer response and how comments have informed the preparation of the Local Plan**

Support noted for the inclusion within the vision of; land allocations to meet housing and employment need, protection of environmental assets and provision for appropriate infrastructure, of all kinds, to support development

A number of respondents commented on the JSP strategic policies and locations for development including proposed alternative strategic sites in South Gloucestershire. The strategic approach to housing numbers and locations will continue to be subject to discussions between the West of England authorities in preparing the JSP. This will then inform our position in drafting the Local Plan on a range of strategic policies. The new SGLP vision will need to reflect the West of England Joint Strategic Plan. New sub areas will be required to reflect the JSP growth areas as well as recognise the needs of the whole district.

A significant number of detailed comments were made in relation to the area specific visions. These included comments objecting to or supporting new non-strategic development in various locations.

Feedback from the Prospectus has been used to prepare the Local Plan Consultation Document as follows:

The comments received have assisted in shaping the strategy for development set out in the new Local Plan Consultation Document, in section 2. The need for allocations and comments received have contributed to the approach to Urban Living and Non-Strategic Growth Options, set out in section 2 of the document. Both will eventually need to make allocations for new homes, employment and other uses to meet growth requirements set in the JSP.

The Non-Strategic Growth Options presented in Part 2 of the Consultation Document have been influenced by comments wishing to see both protection of the Green Belt and consideration of development in Green Belt locations, with options for growth presented that focus on rural locations outside the Green Belt (Option 1), locations inside Green Belt (Option 2) and a combination (Option 3)..

The Non-Strategic Growth section of the plan at this stage does not contain detail on the level of growth possible in each location or suggest sites for development. However the options presented at paragraph 2.73 to 2.79 contain information of the number of existing homes at the villages and settlements in each option, to inform debate, decisions and consultation on non-strategic growth going forward.

**Question 4: Is the draft structure the most appropriate approach?**

- 4.31 The proposed structure of the new SGLP is envisaged to be:
1. Introduction, Priorities and Vision;
  2. Part 1 - Locational Visions, Policies and Site Allocations
  3. Part 2 - Development Management Policies
- 4.32 50 responses were received to this question. Respondents included representatives of the development sector, members of the public, other local authorities, a councillor, prescribed bodies, town/parish councils and other interested parties.
- 4.33 Of these responses, the majority indicated that they felt that the draft structure proposed for the new Local Plan was appropriate. In terms of a breakdown:
- 30 responses (60%) agreed with the proposed draft structure;
  - 4 responses (8%) disagreed with the proposed draft structure
  - 16 responses (32%) neither agreed or disagreed with proposed draft structure
- 4.34 A number of comments were made in support of the proposed draft structure strategy. These included:
- Structure appears sensible and is similar to that commonly used
  - Would be useful if it set out how particular locations may be affected by growth
- 4.35 Very few comments were made against the proposed draft structure strategy.
- 4.36 A number of respondents raised concerns that swapping parts 1 and 2 around might lead to policies becoming a secondary consideration.

**Officer Response and how comments have informed the preparation of the Local Plan**

Support for the general structure of the document is noted. The additional comments have been considered in preparing the Local Plan Consultation Document and will inform the setting of the draft Local Plan.

Part 3 of the new Local Plan Consultation Document takes account of the generally supportive feedback on the structure.

**Question 5: Do you consider the approach to combining policies and the range of policies identified is appropriate to address the land use issues facing South Gloucestershire?**

4.37 83 responses were received to this question. Respondents included representatives of the development sector, members of the public, other local authorities, a councillor, prescribed bodies, town/parish councils and other interested parties.

4.38 Very few comments were made against the proposed approach to combine policies and whether the range of policies identified are appropriate to address the land use issues facing the district, but for those that did the issues raised included:

- No objection in principle – sensible to remove duplication and complexity where possible

4.39 Other key issues raised in response to this question included:

- Policies need to be robust, unambiguous, clear and concise
- Policies need to be useful and have purpose, clearly linked to priorities and vision
- Important that the objectives around sustainable communities, health and well-being and mitigating and adapting to the impacts of Climate Change do not get lost as they are combined owing to /cross-cutting
- Policies need to be in line with but not repeat national policy
- Review both in respect of changing development context and as a result of further clarifications on interpretation of national and local policy and guidance through planning appeal decisions and legal judgements
- Policies must be based on strategic thinking e.g. for Green Belt (and review of), transport
- Policies must ensure that sufficient land for housing is provided/ facilitate provision of land for housing and help to achieve/sustain a 5 year housing land supply
- Issues largely covered by combining policies, however, additional/specific policies might still be necessary regarding safeguarding, e.g. flooding and a potential Nuclear New Build.

**Officer response and how comments have informed the preparation of the Local Plan**

Recognise that there was no objection in principle to the combining of policies. Clear and robust policies that incorporate flexibility to ensure delivery is important, whilst not duplicating national policy and ensuring policies are appropriate in the South Gloucestershire context.

The final draft Plan will include policies that when taken as a whole, will contribute to sustainability, including climate change objectives and health and well-being.

The strategic context will continue to be set by the West of England Joint Spatial Plan. This will then inform our position in draft Local Plan on a range of strategic policies, including housing, employment, transport and Green Belt, as set out in introduction to part 3 in the Local Plan Consultation Document.

Feedback from the Prospectus has been used to prepare Part 3 of Local Plan Consultation Document as follows:

Consideration has been given and some examples have been set out as discussion points on how policies can be effectively combined and where duplication and complexity can be removed. This approach will be taken forward into the setting of policies in the draft Local Plan.

New/expanded policy areas have been set out as discussion points and reflect some of the feedback raised, in particular on climate change and designing for inclusive healthy communities. In completing the draft Local Plan further consideration will be given to the need for other new or expanded policies, taking account of the comments on the Local Plan Consultation Document.

#### **Question 6: Are there other policies that are needed to address the land use issues relevant to South Gloucestershire?**

4.40 93 responses were made to this question. Respondents included representatives of the development sector, members of the public, other local authorities, a councillor, prescribed bodies, town/parish councils and other interested parties. The key issues raised are grouped below into the main chapter headings to which they relate.

#### 4.41 Part 1: Locational Visions, Policies and Site Allocations

- General comments:
  - It should be clear how each of the policies are to be delivered, and what actions will be taken if build rates drop below annualised requirement, e.g. reserve allocations or criteria-based enabling policy
  - 'Use it or Lose it' policy for large developers required
  - Allocated land for quantifiable numbers of houses must come off the 5-year housing land figures immediately.
  - Need to ensure development policies and restrictive policies are complimentary
  - Support deletion of policy PSP8 Residential Amenity.
  
- Policies required on:
  - Place making, linked to the vision for South Gloucestershire as a whole and to the area mini Visions.
  - Location of development and distribution of housing required
  - Protecting greenfield sites, and prioritising previously developed sites
  - Protecting the Green Belt
  - Releasing Green Belt land for development, including for employment uses that considers sustainability as a very special circumstance. Policy should make clear how such release will occur and if necessary the process by which Green Belt extensions might be made elsewhere to compensate for any loss.
  - Releasing Green Belt land for new sports facilities and recreation uses
  - Protecting the countryside, setting out principles for acceptable development in the countryside, linked to need to review settlement boundaries
  - Providing (allocating) land for, and to facilitate, non-strategic growth
  - Oldbury (existing site), including site specific issues and dealing with decommissioning and remediation

- Protection and enhancement of Network Rail’s infrastructure, with developer contributions, e.g. policy requiring developer funds for qualitative improvements in relation to existing facilities and infrastructure, as a result of increased patronage from new development
- Retail policy including a hierarchy of centres
- Include mineral allocations within current policy PSP47 Site Allocations and Safeguarding
- Flooding policy required
- Policy on a potential Nuclear New Build. The existing Oldbury site should be introduced in Part 1 of the plan, in addition to policy PSP46 relating to the Oldbury New Nuclear Build.

#### 4.42 Part 2: Development Management Policies

- General comments:
  - Need to ensure policies don’t lose health objective or that conflict and result in dilution of policy weakening this objective.
  - Development Policies and restrictive Policies should be complimentary
  - Include a CIL/Legal Agreement Policy for infrastructure delivery. Need a clear S106 and CIL Policy to ensure infrastructure funding (including to mitigate flood risk). Recent Government National CIL Review, concludes that the current CIL Regime is not fit for purpose and recommends that a new 'Local Infrastructure Tariff' (LIT) be introduced.

#### 4.43 A. High Quality Design - Improving health and wellbeing

- General comments:
  - Holistic approach to reducing carbon emissions required
- Policies required on:
  - Design, in a single policy
  - Energy efficiency and sustainable construction, which sets a bench-mark for good sustainable communities with a built environment that has a low carbon footprint. It should insist all new housing has sustainable design features:- good insulation standard; integral photo-voltaic roofs; ground heat pump systems; wood burning stoves, as a supplementary heat source; parking for two vehicles off road; housing density that allows adequate 'green' curtilage space; and transport links to reduce over development.
  - Flood risk/relief measures
  - Avoiding building on flood plains
  - Impacts of Climate Change relating to flood risk.
  - Surface water management - with consideration of the cumulative effects of all development in the catchment, not just new proposed development.
  - Maintenance, to ensure attenuated systems are enshrined, audited and enforced.
  - Foul water (through Policy PSP20 review), requiring development proposals to outline proposed Foul Water Drainage Strategy. Also needs to identify land where development would be inappropriate – policies map should identify Development Restraint Zones around sewage works to be read in conjunction with PSP21.

#### 4.44 B. Maintaining economic prosperity

- General comments:
  - Need more flexibility in policies, existing policies (e.g. CS12) are too restrictive and need to acknowledge the role of non-B uses and promote the full range of employment generating uses
  - Employment growth should be matched with housing growth in order to avoid creating dormitory towns
- Policies required on:
  - Small employment sites (outside of identified employment areas) and existing employment sites in the countryside required
  - Requiring employers to facilitate an active lifestyle for employees
  - Employment growth should be matched with housing growth in order to avoid creating dormitory towns

#### 4.45 C. Providing housing for all

- General comments:
  - Priority to improve health and wellbeing is not compatible with nationally described space standards (NDSS)
  - Housing for older people should be based on up to date evidence and respond to local needs within local communities.
  - Policy should require infrastructure to be completed before housebuilding can commence
  - Review of affordable housing delivery required
- Policies required on:
  - Delivering housing for older people, e.g. opportunities to build retirement dwelling within existing residential curtilage. Could be combined with policy on Extra Care Housing
  - New, broader definition of affordable housing
  - Re-use of non-agricultural outbuildings ensuring that any such development protects integrity and significance of other buildings
  - Allocating sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople across the district/WoE
  - Annexes for dependents/carers in rural areas
  - Delivering more housing suitable for young people
  - Encouraging self-build provision
  - Encouraging provision of live/ work units

#### 4.46 D. Successful communities

- General comments:
  - Involve the community through neighbourhood planning

- Policies required on:
  - Community aspirations
  - Addressing strategic inequalities, community well-being, community infrastructure and identity need to be addressed through policy, including a lifetime community policy.
  - Culture and the creative industries / facilities to support economically sustainable communities / centres. Policy on noise mitigation and design associated with such cultural facilities needed but should not have unreasonable restrictions.
  - New sports facilities, which should be fit for purpose and available for community sport
  - Protection and enhancement of sports facilities
  - Protection of the local food supply chain and BMV agricultural land
  - Ensuring that the overloading of key services and infrastructure is prevented

#### 4.47 E. Tackling congestion and improving accessibility

- General comments:
  - Parking Standard detail should be included as an Appendix to the Plan to enable change over time without the need to redraft a Policy
- Policies required on:
  - Assessing the environmental impacts of traffic
  - Promoting sustainable travel/transport choices including accessibility, walking and cycling and provision of public transport facilities to reduce congestion and travel by car.
  - The development and maintenance of PROW
  - Open space, sports provision and community infrastructure standards, including reference to footpaths, bridleways and cycle paths
  - Development proposals affecting the safety of level crossings. Including impact from development on significant increases in vehicular and/or pedestrian traffic.
  - HGV movement, directing B8 uses to locations near motorway network

#### 4.48 Managing the environment and heritage

- General comments:
  - The production of a trees and woodland strategy is encouraged
- Policies required on:
  - Forest of Avon Community Forest to ensure development is planned in a coherent long-term manner, delivering environmental infrastructure and safeguards.
  - Conservation, protection and enhancement of historic environment
  - Cotswolds AONB, in order to ensure the conservation and enhancement of the special qualities

#### **Officer response and how comments have informed the preparation of the Local Plan**

It is acknowledged that the final suite of policies will need to be designed to ensure that developments deliver a high quality, sustainable scheme, in the right location, providing for the

needs of the community, whilst reflecting the strategic policy framework outlined in the Joint Spatial Plan.

The final Plan will need to be accompanied by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Feedback from the Prospectus has been used to prepare the Local Plan Consultation Document as follows:

The role of Neighbourhood Planning will also need to be covered in the new Local Plan as set out in para 1.7 of the Local Plan Consultation Document.

Support for specific policy areas are noted, many of which are already part of the adopted South Gloucestershire Development Plan, in either the Core Strategy or Policies, Sites and Places Plan. Part 3 of the Local Plan Consultation Document includes a number of discussion points on potential new or expanded policy areas.

In completing the draft Local Plan further consideration will be given to the need for other new or expanded policies which might be needed, taking account of the comments on the Local Plan Consultation Document.

**Question 7: Are there other policies that are needed to address the land use issues relevant to South Gloucestershire?**

N/A. As set out at para 4.3 above.

**Question 8: Do you have any comments on the methodology used to construct the Sustainable Access Profiles? For example comments on the approach to defining the range of key services and facilities, assessing walking and cycling and public transport access.**

4.49 There were a number of key issues raised in response to this question, and they fall under the 8 main headings.

4.50 Transport options

Comments focussed on the quality and quantity of existing routes including bus time tables and frequency and coverage. Comments have also focused on the route quality especially for walking and cycling routes. It also suggests that the profiles look at other means of travel such as train connectivity. Some comments point out that the car is the main source of travel in the area and so should not be ignored even if it is recognised that the profiles have to focus on sustainable travel.

4.51 Access and target distance used

Comments have suggested alternative options for measuring the distance of services and facilities which would be much more accurate than using 'as the crow flies' centroids. Looking at individual route quality was praised as a means to give a much more accurate assessment of the distances to services and facilities.

The target distances used to include or exclude services and facilities was also commented upon. Comments suggested that the distances were too far whilst others have suggested that route quality may allow people to travel further. Some comments have suggested alternative distances. However there was also support for the method, rationale and use of established distances.

In terms of public transport it has been suggested that access to a suitably frequent and timed bus is not a sufficient metric alone and that reporting the time taken for services to reach destinations would be a useful way of comparing and contrasting the public transport connectivity of different settlements

4.52 Methodology

These comments have focused on the 2017 methodology used to create the profiles. Many comments have voiced support for the methodology in general and that this shows a step in the right direction. With common support for established distances used, and many of the services and facilities considered.

Some comments suggest that certain services should not be included whilst others should. On top of this the inclusion of other factors that may affect these settlements has also been suggested such as heritage, character and environmental issues. Others have pointed out that the residents of the settlements could have a greater involvement in the creation of the profiles. Their use and usefulness has also been discussed with some unsure about how these can be used and how useful they may be as a snapshot in time.

4.53 Scoring hierarchy

In previous versions of the Sustainable Access Profiles (SAPs) a scoring system and subsequent hierarchy of sustainable access has been used. For this version the scoring

hierarchy was removed in favour of an approach that reported the number of facilities and public transport connections. A small number of developers promoting individual sites favoured the return to a hierarchy.

4.54 Access to services

One of the most frequent comments on the SAP was that access to Hospitals and Accident and Emergency Departments should be included.

The profiles have focused on services and facilities within the Local Authority Area however comments suggest that some settlements may be distorted in terms of sustainable access due to the absence of services within the target distances but which are located in neighbouring authorities and should be included.

4.55 Capacity of services

Although access to services and facilities has been assessed, several comments suggested that capacity should also be considered especially if the profiles will lead to housing allocations.

4.56 Employment

A number of comments raised the issue of the need to consider growth in employment opportunities alongside housing growth to prevent dormitory commuter settlements. Other comments included assessment of the number and quality of jobs as well as working from home capacity. Another issue raised was the use of major employers at a threshold of 100 employees as unreflective of the rural economy, so that smaller employers should be considered.

4.57 Evidence base

Some comments highlighted the importance of up to date information.

**Officer response and how comments have informed the preparation of the Local Plan**

It is important that the Sustainable Access Profiles (SAPs) are built on a robust methodology which has evolved through two consultation processes. However, many responses have been received which relate to the 8 topics listed above.

Some issues raised may be outside the scope of the Sustainable Access Profiles and methodology but may instead need to be progressed through other aspects of the new local plan. Other comments may relate to previous aspects of the methodology which has since been superseded. Although these changes will have already been justified it may be appropriate to reassess and confirm our preferred approach.

The council will be updating the analysis of public transport connections to locations containing key services and facilities to include the following actions:

- Revision to timetables between April 2017 and September 2017
- An assessment of journey times to allow comparison between each settlement's public transport connections
- An update of this information in the Sustainable Access Profiles
- Publish a separate Public Transport Connections Findings report.

The council will be undertaking a new analysis of public transport connections from settlements and villages to the Bristol Royal Infirmary, Southmead and Bath Royal United hospitals. This may be reported within the Sustainable Access Profiles or published as standalone evidence.

The council is not proposing to implement a scoring or weighting system based on the range and number of key services and facilities, and public transport connections which can be accessed from a village or settlement. However, there will be a “Sustainable Access Findings Table”. This will clearly show the variance in cycling and walking access to key services and facilities, and the number of public transport connections from each village and settlement. This will assist in establishing each settlement’s level of walking, cycling and public transport access to key services and facilities, showing variations of sustainable access amongst the villages and settlements.

The updated Sustainability Appraisal Methodology and latest information in relation to Public Transport will be released along with the SGLP Consultation Document in early 2018. At this time the updated and revised SAPs will also be released.

Feedback from the Prospectus has been used to prepare the Local Plan Consultation Document as follows:

The updated information, SAP profiles and public transport updates have all been used to determine which rural locations are suitable to investigate for Non-Strategic Growth.

The SGLP Consultation Document , in Part 2 (paragraph 2.56 to 2.60) sets out that the Sustainable Access information has been used to discount locations which lack a basic and minimum level of walking, cycling and public transport to key Services and Facilities, as potential locations for Non-Strategic Growth. The 34 locations considered suitable to investigate for growth have been used to construct 3 Options for where non-strategic growth might be delivered. Please see Part 2, Non-Strategic Growth (paragraph 2.67 – 2.78)

**Question 9: Do you have any comments on the findings and detail of individual Sustainable Access Profiles? E.g. are certain key services and facilities included which should not be, or are others missing?**

4.58 Owing to the nature of the question, the majority of responses to this question related to matters of detail in relation to specific sustainable access profiles (SAPs).

4.59 In addition to these detailed points, it was suggested that SAPs be prepared for the following locations:

- Dodington Parish
- Hanham
- Tortworth
- Leyhill
- Parkfield

4.60 Detailed comments made in relation to specific SAPs are set out below.

Issue
<p>Almondsbury:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with SAP that has good access to key services and facilities.</li> </ul>
<p>Bitton:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Post Office has closed</li> <li>• Lease of Jones Convenience Store coming to an end and future is uncertain</li> <li>• Settlements close to boundary should take account of facilities across the boundary i.e. at Keynsham.</li> <li>• There is no public transport to Emersons Green - Only bus services to run through Bitton are 37 &amp; 19.</li> <li>• The Grange School has closed</li> </ul>
<p>Coalpit Heath:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only one school within walking/cycling distance that fulfils safety requirement - which is 98% full.</li> <li>• Only one GP</li> <li>• Only one Bus to Southmead Hospital, from Coalpit Heath which does not return after 7pm.</li> <li>• Coalpit Heath should not be referred to as a town in the SA</li> <li>• St Saviours Church Hall is a community centre that should be included</li> <li>• The Sainsbury's on Badminton Road is only a local, not a supermarket</li> <li>• Superfast Broadband coverage varies throughout the village.</li> </ul>
<p>Charfield:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Range of employment in Charfield, Charfield Barns Business Park, Charfield Mills Industrial Estate, the MJ Fews Car Dealership.</li> <li>• 93% travel to work by the car.</li> </ul>
<p>Cromhall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has 730 residents and approx 300 houses - in the Parish.</li> <li>• Broadband not available for all</li> <li>• Public Transport info for Cromhall inaccurate (difficult to reach Yate pre 9am).</li> </ul>
<p>Engine Common:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Special due to proximity to Yate.</li> </ul>
<p>Falfield:</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Village Hall - Community Centre location incorrect.</li> <li>• Village Hall should not be considered a community centre.</li> <li>• Happy Auto's Ltd should not be recorded as a comparison store – no comparison stores</li> <li>• Having no Sunday public transport should be reflected</li> <li>• Falfield should not be considered as having Superfast Broadband.</li> <li>• Falfield public transport incorrect - consider access to North Fringe of Bristol, Bristol and Cam &amp; Dursley Rail Station.</li> <li>• Post Office important asset</li> </ul>
<p>Frampton Cotterell:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land at Park Farm, Frampton Cotterell Appeal Statement set out settlement has access to facilities and services and employment.</li> </ul>
<p>Hawkesbury:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has no Sunday public transport service.</li> </ul>
<p>Marshfield:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wedding comparison shop is an online shop operating from someone's home and should not be included.</li> <li>• 2. Two typos referring to Charfield</li> </ul>
<p>Oldbury on Severn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Magnox as within 2000m walk or cycle of settlement</li> </ul>
<p>Old Sodbury:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need space between two Primary and add an s to mile.</li> <li>• It is felt that weekend buses should be to "Chipping Sodbury &amp; Yate".</li> <li>• Access to major employers – it is felt that the Hatters Lane Safeguarded Employment Area is within 2km of O/S.</li> <li>• Community Facilities – The Crosshands Hotel (on A46) is within the Parish of Old Sodbury and certainly within 800m of O/S.</li> <li>• Retail &amp; Food Facilities – The number of Comparison Retail Stores is shown as 0. The description is shops selling goods and services other than food... If this is the case then there are quite a number of stores including hairdressers, a garage, gift shops, jewellery shop, card shop, clothes shop etc.</li> <li>• Post Office is now in High Street, Chipping Sodbury. Also under Local Convenience is the Post Office which is now within the Cotswold Vintners.</li> <li>• Shivas News &amp; Stores (under local convenience) needs to be removed.</li> </ul>
<p>Pucklechurch:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The comparisons stores do not exist, the two that do exist are missing from the SAP.</li> <li>• The prison is no longer a Young Offenders Institute</li> <li>• There is no bus route to Kingswood.</li> <li>• Post Office has moved from Westerleigh Road, now incorporated into convenience store.</li> </ul>
<p>Severn Beach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SAP ignores access to rail station which give excellent public transport access.</li> <li>• Public House, Kings Arms in Pilning within 1200m is considered walkable</li> </ul>
<p>Thornbury:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Figures are out of date.</li> <li>• The SAP should be put together through a community consultation workshop environment.</li> <li>• Alexander Workwear and the council offices are no longer major employers.</li> <li>• The Armstrong Hall Complex is missing from the list of dedicated community centres</li> <li>• The address for the White Lion Public House is incorrect.</li> <li>• There are some Pubs missing from the list - The Malthouse, The Wheatsheaf, Hawkes House, The Royal George.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a second Lloyds Pharmacy in the High Street which is not listed.</li> <li>• There is no longer a Gillingstool Post Office in Oakleaze Road.</li> <li>• The target distances are taken from the centre of Thornbury which bears no relation to the high street of Thornbury to the west.</li> <li>• Public Transport routes need to be checked.</li> <li>• Alexander Workwear are still operating on Midland Way and Orchard Catering Supplies have now closed.</li> <li>• Misleading to separate two GPs from Health Centre as they operate out of the same facility.</li> <li>• Convenience shops listed do not meet the criteria for "meeting day to day food needs" - W H Smith or News 4U do not sell food.</li> <li>• Alan Pendrey Butchers; The Thornbury Deli; Masons Fruit &amp; Veg and Traditional Meats of Thornbury are specialist shops that do not provide a range of basic food stuffs.</li> <li>• Hamiltons does not exist.</li> <li>• Motorcycles Direct operates out of Europa Group and so is the same employer.</li> <li>• Alexandra Workwear still operate from Midland Way but their major site closed and it is not clear if they still meet major employer criteria.</li> <li>• Public transport within Thornbury should also be considered, not just to the town</li> </ul>
<p>Tytherington:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has good Sustainable Access to GP in Thornbury.</li> <li>• Tytherington Broadband ('Broadband rollout and project information' page) planned for Tytherington for June 2017 - therefore current lack of access should not count against sustainability.</li> </ul>
<p>Yate and Thornbury:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public transport within these towns should also be considered, not just to the town</li> </ul>
<p>Westerleigh:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not have superfast broadband.</li> <li>• There are 242 residences not 182.</li> </ul>
<p>Wickwar:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major employer should be included: Alderley Plc</li> </ul>
<p>Winterbourne</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree that dentists are included.</li> <li>• Agree with the inclusion of Safeguarded Employment Areas. Access to employment is important.</li> <li>• Agree with the importance of convenience stores.</li> <li>• 4. Winterbourne has scored high and so is a desirable place for growth.</li> </ul>

**Officer response and how comments have informed the preparation of the Local Plan**

Accurate Sustainable Access Profiles (SAPs) will be important in helping prepare the new Local Plan. Several responses were received in relation to specific aspects of individual Sustainable Access Profiles. These comments have been investigated, with errors corrected, and new information added where appropriate. The updated Sustainable Access Profiles will be published to support the SGLP Consultation Document in early 2018.

Feedback from the Prospectus has been used to prepare the Local Plan Consultation Document as follows:

The updated information, SAP profiles and public transport updates have all been used to determine which rural locations are suitable to investigate for non-strategic growth in the SGLP Consultation Document.

The SGLP Consultation Document , in Part 2 (paragraph 2.56 to 2.60) sets out that the Sustainable Access information has been used to discount locations which lack a basic and minimum level of walking, cycling and public transport to key services and facilities, as potential locations for Non-Strategic Growth. The 34 locations considered suitable to investigate for growth have been used to construct 3 Options for where non-strategic growth might be further investigated. Please see Part 2, Non-Strategic Growth (paragraph 2.67 – 2.78).

The information in the SAPs has also informed the sustainability appraisal process of the non-strategic growth options. Going forward the SAPs will provide valuable evidence to assist future decisions and debate on how much growth should take place in each suitable rural locations

### **Additional Comments Received**

Some comments were made that did not fit the questions regarding the new SGLP. Therefore to aid the analysis of these comments these are highlighted below for information. These will be considered in preparing the new Local Plan, or other documents, as appropriate.

4.61 The main issues raised through representations related to the following broad issues:

- General comments
- Evidence
- Policy
- Comments regarding the Joint Spatial Plan (JSP)
- Comments regarding individual sites included within the Call for Sites

4.62 General comments

- Town and parish councils should lead the process in deciding locations for housing growth
- Objection to the top down approach to development of new Local Plan
- Individual areas should be considered for their unique sites and benefits which they bring to the existing communities.
- Authorities should work together to achieve the best use of land and ensure proper service (e.g. health and education) provision, especially in areas where facilities are already under pressure.
- A number of representations raised issues relating to process, for example:
  - Commend the council on its aim to move quickly through the Local Plan process, and its commitment to early engagement and collaboration.
  - The Plan should be high-level and as focussed on outcomes as far as possible
  - The Prospectus over-complicates and goes beyond what is required by the Regulations - presenting key policies, vision etc. is unnecessary at this stage.
  - Lack of consultation on the plan.
  - Open community engagement needed including via social media.
  - The Plan and information relating to it should be made user friendly by utilising interactive mapping, providing detail on the form, scale and quantum of new development, and other digital technology both in consultation, engagement

and final presentation, which is an objective of the Housing White Paper, to ensure commenting is easier and the Plan more concise, clear and transparent

- The Call for Sites map is slow to navigate.
- The process should allow for some flexibility in case of unforeseen issues or external influences e.g. changes in National Policies that would affect the local economy.
- Too much emphasis on the JSP and devolution and not enough on local priorities.
- Concern that new Local Plan (NLP) won't re-open or repeat matters addressed in JSP.
- Joint Transport Study should be mentioned in nLP as well as the Joint Spatial Plan (JSP).
- Good that nLP is being prepared in parallel with JSP.
- Important to ensure both the JSP and the NLP work to the same timescales. However timetable is optimistic. Concerned that the differing plan periods would automatically cause an undersupply of housing in South Gloucestershire, because the Core Strategy housing requirement is significantly lower than anticipated through the JSP.
- Impact of delays in JSP on nLP processes.
- Essential that the JSP examination matters raised are adequately addressed in the new Local Plan.

#### 4.63 Evidence

- Evidence base is essential to delivering a robust, sound Plan
- Green Belt Review essential in assessing land availability for development (housing, employment, transport).
- Local evidence is required to establish:
  - Spatial strategy, including infrastructure requirements
  - local housing needs for affordable homes and for specific age groups;
  - a local Infrastructure Delivery Plan (to inc. rail infrastructure) and a Housing Implementation Strategy which will be an essential part of the evidence for the Plan and its delivery
  - local employment needs
- Settlement boundary review required to help meet housing need in the rural areas, e.g. Hawkesbury.
- All sites should be considered equal at early stage or process.
- Each site included must be re-examined in respect of its deliverability
- General concerns about the Call for Sites process, including whether sites put forward are the most suitable for the community.
- Plan and supporting evidence needs to be consistent with the Housing White Paper, particularly in respect of the delivery tests

#### 4.64 Policy

- Concerns that policies about prosperity, congestion, community, environment and heritage are seen as 'annoying' obstacles to be overcome
- Neighbourhood Plans should be prepared in parallel with/one step behind nSGLP
- Growth should be planned on basis of evidence, and decided upon by the council.

- Should include flexibility to keep up with any changes to circumstances
- Policy must establish an appropriate Spatial Strategy for the long term, integrating new and existing development with necessary infrastructure to deliver required and worthwhile development.
- Development should be located in urban areas
- Changes required to Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to ensure maximum payments and monies targeted to community facilities
- Proposed growth should be planned on the basis of what infrastructure is there and what can be delivered, to ensure that it isn't stretched. Infrastructure should go in first – ensure there isn't a lag.
- Strategic retail policies must be included as they are not included in the JSP
- Chipping Sodbury Station should be reopened

#### 4.65 Joint Spatial Plan (JSP)

- Chipping Sodbury station should be reopened
- Need for a rebalancing of the development around Bristol, and around North Somerset, e.g. Long Ashton to avoid the disproportionate growth to the north into South Gloucestershire;
- Concerns that disproportionate amount of development planned in South Gloucestershire in the JSP, i.e. extent of Green Belt means available land for development in two large areas, creating over urbanisation, the Green Belt should be reviewed;
- Over-development of West of England (WoE) area will weaken its special character;
- The housing requirement for the WoE is higher than suggested in JSP;
- Focus on undeveloped brownfield sites, before greenfield, especially in Bristol.
- Sound planning is needed not political decisions, this is required if the Buckover Garden Village is rejected.
- Need to reconsider future developments.
- The JSP doesn't currently address strategic retail policies or town centres, support strategic growth in Yate, however, it must be supported by a strong and resilient Town Centre.
- Sufficient flexibility is needed to respond to future changes and to deliver the outcomes of the JSP.
- The JSP has pointed towards rural areas to help meet the housing needs

#### 4.66 Comments regarding individual sites included within the Call for Sites (CfS)

- A number of objections were received to individual sites included within the Call for Sites, many of which made detailed points that will be considered through any future site selection process. The majority of these objections were made in relation to sites in two areas:
  - Land East of St. John's Way (Chipping Sodbury)
  - Sites on West side of the village off St. Martins Lane and the High Street; site off St. Martin's Lane to the South of the Village (Marshfield)
- Concerns were raised about the sites included in Thornbury and impacts of more growth.

- Concerns were raised about the sites included within the Green Belt in the Bristol East Fringe, particularly around Hanham and Longwell Green.

### **Initial Officer Response**

#### General comments

The Local Plan strategic approach will continue to be subject to discussions between the West of England authorities in preparing the WoE JSP. The South Gloucestershire Local Plan will be prepared in full consultation and engagement with Town and Parish Councils and the wider community. The Plan is required to cover a 15 year period, which the plan period of 2018 – 2036 exceeds. It will be important for the Plan to have a rolling 5 year housing land supply, in accordance with national policy. Neighbourhood Planning will also be reflected in the Local Plan.

Comments on the process are noted. In particular, the Plan is at the earliest stage and the Prospectus was a means to gain suggestions for the direction the Local Plan should seek to take. Further consultation will be undertaken, providing more detail and structure and a further opportunity to comment and engage. Infrastructure delivery will be considered as the new Local Plan is prepared.

#### Evidence

The importance of evidence base is noted. A range of evidence is proposed to support the Plan's preparation, including e.g. Green Belt. The range of evidence base required will be kept under review as the Plan progresses. The methodologies used in the preparation of evidence will also be kept under review and in line with best practice. A full review of the Housing White Paper will be considered as the Plan progresses, as necessary.

#### Policy

The suite of policies proposed will need to be designed to ensure that all developments deliver a high quality, sustainable scheme, in the right location, providing for the needs of the community, whilst reflecting the strategic policy framework outlined in the JSP and evidence. The new Local Plan will be supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

#### JSP Comments

Comments regarding the Joint Spatial Plan (JSP) are noted.

#### CFS Comments

Comments regarding individual sites included within the Call for Sites are noted.

## **5. Next steps**

- 5.1 All comments received have been used as part of preparing the next stage of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan 2018 – 2036 and will
- 5.2 take place in early 2018. Further details are available on our website at [www.southglos.gov.uk/newlocalplan](http://www.southglos.gov.uk/newlocalplan).

## Appendices

### Appendix A: Email and Letter text

#### New South Gloucestershire Council Local Plan 2018 – 2036: Prospectus

##### *‘Looking ahead and planning for our future’*

We would like your input to help prepare the new Local Plan for South Gloucestershire, which will steer development in the district over the next 20 years.

The first stage of this work is to invite your views on our new Local Plan prospectus document, and what you feel the new Local Plan ought to contain.

The South Gloucestershire Council Local Plan (2018-2036) prospectus sets out the proposed scope, and programme for preparing the new Local Plan. We also want to share with you our strategic priorities for the area, and how the council will deliver new development in line with the vision and aspirations of our local communities and the needs of people who live, work and invest in South Gloucestershire.

Publishing and consulting on this prospectus document will very much be the start of the process of preparing the new Local Plan.

We hope stakeholders and communities will want to be part of the new Local Plan and will get involved in its preparation.

#### **About the new Local Plan**

The South Gloucestershire Core Strategy was adopted in December 2013 and includes a commitment by the council to an early review. In addition, the council is working with the three other West of England unitary authorities to prepare the Joint Spatial Plan (JSP). The JSP will set out the overall amount of residential and employment development and where it should be located across the West of England sub-region, as well as the infrastructure required to support that growth.

Part of the Local Plan’s purpose will be to allocate strategic sites at locations identified in the JSP, as well as to allocate sites for non-strategic development. The Local Plan will also set out the suite of planning policies that will be used to deliver sustainable development in South Gloucestershire.

#### **Let us know what you think**

Consultation on the Local Plan prospectus document runs from Thursday 12 January – Thursday 23 February 2017.

You can view the consultation documents and provide your feedback at [www.southglos.gov.uk/newlocalplanprospectus](http://www.southglos.gov.uk/newlocalplanprospectus).

Please do take the opportunity to use our online consultation system to respond, as this ensures that your comments will be dealt with in the most efficient way possible. Comments can also be

submitted via email ([planningldf@southglos.gov.uk](mailto:planningldf@southglos.gov.uk)) or post. [Please note all comments only need to be submitted once i.e. by email or by post.](#)

You will also be kept informed of the progress with the new Local Plan and receive news of future consultations.

The Local Plan prospectus document is 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, more information on one stop shops can be found at [www.southglos.gov.uk/council-and-democracy/customer-services/one-stop-shop-clinics-and-surgeries/](http://www.southglos.gov.uk/council-and-democracy/customer-services/one-stop-shop-clinics-and-surgeries/). You can also view the Local Plan prospectus document at your nearest South Gloucestershire Library (please see [www.southglos.gov.uk/libraries](http://www.southglos.gov.uk/libraries) for locations and opening times).

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 is: 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.

## **Appendix B: Text sent to Town and Parish Councils to confirm consultation launch**

### ***‘Looking ahead and planning for our future’***

Dear Clerks

Further to my email of 23 December 2016 inviting you to a briefing session on the new South Gloucestershire Local Plan on 20 January, I can confirm that the Local Plan prospectus has been published for consultation.

#### **Context**

The new Local Plan for South Gloucestershire will steer development in the district over the next 20 years.

The first stage of this work is to invite comments on the new Local Plan prospectus, and what stakeholders think the new Local Plan ought to contain. The prospectus sets out the proposed scope, and programme for preparing the new Local Plan.

#### **About the new Local Plan**

The South Gloucestershire Core Strategy was adopted in December 2013 and includes a commitment by the council to an early review. In addition, the council is working with the three other West of England unitary authorities to prepare the Joint Spatial Plan (JSP). The JSP will set out the overall amount of residential and employment development and where it should be located across the West of England sub-region, as well as the infrastructure required to support that growth.

Part of the Local Plan’s purpose will be to allocate strategic sites at locations identified in the JSP, as well as to allocate sites for non-strategic development. The Local Plan will also set out the suite of planning policies that will be used to deliver sustainable development in South Gloucestershire.

#### **Let us know what you think**

Consultation on the Local Plan prospectus runs from Thursday 12 January – Thursday 23 February 2017.

You can view the Local Plan prospectus and supporting documents and provide your feedback at [www.southglos.gov.uk/newlocalplanprospectus](http://www.southglos.gov.uk/newlocalplanprospectus). [The consultation documents are available to view at all South Gloucestershire Council One Stop Shops and libraries.](#)

Please be aware that this information has also been provided to all South Gloucestershire Council elected Members.

If you require any further information please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Kind regards,

Patrick Conroy  
Strategic Planning Policy and Specialist Advice Team Manager

## Appendix C: Invitation to briefing

Dear Clerks,

The first stage of the council's new Local Plan will be published for public consultation on 12<sup>th</sup> January for 6 weeks. Further details explaining this will be provided to you all in early January ahead the consultation commencing. Ahead of this the report to P&R Committee on 12<sup>th</sup> December 2016 regarding the South Glos new local Plan is available [under item 17 of the agenda \(please click link to view\)](#).

To help explain the new Local Plan we would like to invite you to a briefing to be held at our Yate offices at 10.00 on 20<sup>th</sup> January. This will be an opportunity for officers to introduce what we are undertaking and answer any questions. Please could you email [PlanningLDF@southglos.gov.uk](mailto:PlanningLDF@southglos.gov.uk) to confirm attendance.

SGC ward councillors – you are very welcome to attend this briefing, alternatively, depending on demand we would be happy to arrange a further/ separate session and will review this in early January.

Can I also take this opportunity to wish everyone a merry Christmas and happy New Year.

Regards

Patrick

## Appendix D: Article in the Gazette 13<sup>th</sup> January 2017

http://www.gazetteseries.co.uk/news/15021637.South

South Gloucestershire Cou...

JOB'S HOMES MOTORS Book an Ad Business directory Local Info Dating Exchange and Mart

Dursley 14°C Register Sign in

# Gazette

News Sport E-editions Events What's On Announcements National News National Sport News Education

News Gloucestershire Thornbury Yate and Sodbury News in Brief Letters National Send us your Photos

13th January

## South Gloucestershire Council begins consultation on new planning document

http://www.gazetteseries.co.uk/homes/



### South Gloucestershire Council begins consultation on new planning document

[f](#) [t](#) [G+](#) [e](#)

Get the latest local news straight to your inbox every day  [Sign up](#)

RESIDENTS in South Gloucestershire are being asked to give their views as the council begins consulting on a major policy document.

The new South Gloucestershire Local Plan will guide development in the area from 2018 to 2036 and will be used when making decisions on planning applications.

The consultation lasts for six weeks until February 23 and people are being asked for their feedback and to let South Gloucestershire Council know what they feel should be included in the plan.

More detail on the document is available at [southglos.gov.uk/newlocalplanprospectus](http://southglos.gov.uk/newlocalplanprospectus)

Planning, transport and strategic environment lead member Cllr Colin Hunt said: "We would like to encourage everyone who lives and works in the area to comment on our new Local Plan prospectus.

"It is important that we have up to date local plan policies to determine planning applications against, so please get involved, have your say and let us know what you think should be included."

#### Most popular

- 1 Thornbury company goes into liquidation after 30 years of trading
- 2 Leaders of Thornbury primary school speak out over 'inaccurate' and 'disappointing' online debate over toilets plan
- 3 Cyclist left seriously injured after riding into stationary van near Dursley
- 4 31-year-old man charged with 29 counts of rape
- 5 A38 between Thornbury and Tytherington partially blocked after accident

#### Most commented

- 6 Two teenagers arrested in Cam after suspected possession of cannabis
- 7 Residents' pleas to restore 82 bus service to Chipping Sodbury to be considered as part of new review
- 8 Pupils at Almondsbury Primary School visited by real life

Last year, in partnership with three neighbouring authorities, the council published the latest stage of the Joint Spatial Plan as well as the 'Joint Transport Vision Summary' document. These set out the overall amount of residential and employment development required, and where it should be located across the West of England, along with the West of England's vision to address current transport issues and how best to deal with the impact of future growth for the next 20 years.

The Joint Spatial Plan will ultimately provide the strategic context covering the period up to 2036, which the new local plan will need to comply with.



This means that the amount and locations of new housing and employment set out in the Joint Spatial Plan which relate to South Gloucestershire will need to be included in and delivered through the new local plan.

Both plans, upon their adoption, will be used by the council to determine planning applications.



Forrest Gump

- 9 £30,000 jackpot is neighbours' second lottery win in seven months
- 10 Dursley school bus driver Martin Smith, 40, jailed for three years for child sex offences after police sting
- 11 Stroud MP accuses Dursley care provider of 'bullying' and fears staff shortages could lead to closure
- 12 FEATURE: Lee Driver-Dickerson on his career in cricket and football
- 13 Planning applications
- 14 Yate Men's Shed gets off the ground
- 15 Crossways Junior School in Thornbury celebrates successful Ofsted inspection
- 16 Schoolgirl from Thornbury, 10, calls for better road safety with new zebra crossing in letter to council  
to be called Brian - means for south west
- 18 Councillors meet to discuss improvements to children's services in South Gloucestershire following 'inadequate' Ofsted rating
- 19 Concorde museum opens doors to public in South Gloucestershire
- 20 Seafood restaurant in Arlingham officially ranked as the best in the south

## Appendix E: Text displayed on the Current planning policy consultations Webpage

### Current consultations

- Consultation on the new South Gloucestershire Local Plan prospectus document runs from 12 January 2017 to 23 February. Details on this consultation can be found at [www.southglos.gov.uk/newlocalplanprospectus](http://www.southglos.gov.uk/newlocalplanprospectus).

### Recent consultations on documents which are still in preparation:

- Joint Spatial Plan (JSP) and Joint Transport Study (JTS) – public consultation on the Joint Spatial Plan (JSP) and Joint Transport Study (JTS) ran for 6 weeks from 11 November 2016 to 19 December 2016. Details on this consultation can be found at [www.jointplanningwofe.org.uk](http://www.jointplanningwofe.org.uk).
- Policies, Sites and Places Plan - information regarding the PSP Plan can be viewed at [www.southglos.gov.uk/policiessitesandplaces](http://www.southglos.gov.uk/policiessitesandplaces). Information regarding the Examination in Public can be viewed at [www.southglos.gov.uk/PSPexamination](http://www.southglos.gov.uk/PSPexamination).

### Adopted planning policy documents:

- [Local Plan Documents](#)
- [Supplementary Planning Documents](#)
- [Statement of Community Involvement \(SCI\)](#)
- [Community Infrastructure Levy \(CIL\)](#)

## New South Gloucestershire Local Plan (2018 – 2036)

Planning law requires that planning decisions are made in accordance with the Council's Local Plan.

The new SGLP will be a development plan document (DPD) covering the whole administrative area of South Gloucestershire and the plan period will be 2018-2036. It will review and eventually replace existing local planning documents including the:

- South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy- 2006-2027 (2013)
- South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan

As you may be aware, the council is working with the three other West of England unitary authorities to prepare the Joint Spatial Plan (JSP). The JSP will set out the overall amount of new residential and employment development, and where it should be located across the West of England sub-region, as well as the infrastructure required to support that growth e.g. schools, transport, community facilities and green spaces.

Part of the new Local Plan's purpose will be to allocate sites for strategic development at locations identified in the JSP, as well as to allocate new sites for non-strategic development in the district. The Local Plan will also set out the suite of planning policies that will be used to deliver sustainable development in South Gloucestershire.

### Consultation

The first stage of preparing the new South Gloucestershire Local Plan is to invite comments on our new **Local Plan prospectus**, and what you feel the new Local Plan ought to contain. This consultation runs from 12 January 2017 to 23 February. Details on this consultation can be found at [www.southglos.gov.uk/newlocalplanprospectus](http://www.southglos.gov.uk/newlocalplanprospectus).

### Consultation database

If you are not currently on our consultation database and would like to be kept informed, please email [PlanningPolicy@southglos.gov.uk](mailto:PlanningPolicy@southglos.gov.uk). From time to time we may contact you to seek your views about other planning consultations and projects. Periodically, you may also be invited to give us your views about our service.

**Appendix G: Text displayed on the New South Gloucestershire Council Local Plan 2018-2036:  
Prospectus webpage**

## **New South Gloucestershire Council Local Plan 2018 – 2036: prospectus**

### ***‘Looking ahead and planning for our future’***

We would like your input to help prepare the new Local Plan for South Gloucestershire, which will steer development in the district over the next 20 years.

The first stage of this work is to invite your views on our new Local Plan prospectus, and what you feel the new Local Plan ought to contain.

The South Gloucestershire Council Local Plan (2018-2036) prospectus sets out the proposed scope, and programme for preparing the new Local Plan. We also want to share with you our strategic priorities for the area, and how the council will deliver new development in line with the vision and aspirations of our local communities and the needs of people who live, work and invest in South Gloucestershire.

Publishing and consulting on this prospectus is the start of the process of preparing the new Local Plan.

### **About the new Local Plan**

The new SGLP will be a development plan document (DPD) covering the whole of South Gloucestershire and the plan period will be 2018-2036. It will review, and eventually replace, existing local planning documents including the:

- South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy- 2006-2027 (2013) and the
- South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan

As you may know the council is working with the three other West of England unitary authorities to prepare the Joint Spatial Plan (JSP). The JSP will set out the overall amount of residential and employment development and where it should be located across the West of England sub-region, as well as the infrastructure required to support that growth including for example schools, transport infrastructure, community facilities and green spaces.

Part of the Local Plan’s purpose will be to allocate strategic sites for development at locations identified in the JSP, as well as to allocate sites for non-strategic development in the district. The Local Plan will also set out the suite of planning policies that will be used to deliver sustainable development in South Gloucestershire.

### **Let us know what you think**

Consultation on the Local Plan prospectus document runs from Thursday 12 January – Thursday 23 February 2017.

The following documents are available to view:

- The new Local Plan prospectus (online response version)
- The new Local Plan prospectus (PDF version)
- Topic Paper 1: Key priorities and vision for the new Local Plan
- Topic Paper 2: Structure and policies for the new Local Plan
- Sustainable access profiles and methodology

## **Call for Sites**

Please use this link to:

- view sites which were previously submitted to the council by landowners, developers and agents for consideration for potential development
- submit up to date information about previously submitted sites; or
- submit new sites for consideration.

## **Making comments**

Please do take the opportunity to use our online consultation system to respond (see above), as this ensures that your comments will be dealt with in the most efficient way possible.

Comments can also be submitted via email or post, using the response form. Please note all comments only need to be submitted once i.e. by email or by post.

- By e-mail: [PlanningLDF@southglos.gov.uk](mailto: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.

## **Availability of documents**

The Local Plan prospectus document is available to view at the council's One-Stop Shops. Opening times are:

- 8.45am - 5pm Monday to Wednesday
- 8.45am - 4.30pm Thursday and Friday

More information on one stop shops can be found at [www.southglos.gov.uk/council-and-democracy/customer-services/one-stop-shop-clinics-and-surgeries/](http://www.southglos.gov.uk/council-and-democracy/customer-services/one-stop-shop-clinics-and-surgeries/).

You can also view the Local Plan prospectus document at your nearest South Gloucestershire Library (please see [www.southglos.gov.uk/libraries](http://www.southglos.gov.uk/libraries) for locations and opening times).

## **Next Steps**

Comments received will be considered and used to inform the preparation of the draft Plan during 2017. Further details on this will be provided in due course. Please continue to check our website for further information and updates.

## **Data Protection**

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 is: 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.

## Appendix H: Call for Sites webpage

# Local plan – call for sites

When producing a local plan a call for potential sites and broad locations for development can be made.

The call for sites register provides one source of potential allocations to address the identified need for a range of uses. The sites are promoted by landowners, agents and developers for the council to consider when preparing its local plan. Information collected through the call for sites will help to prepare the council's Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (HELAA). This will involve analysing potential sites to evaluate which could contribute to meeting housing or other need in accord with the plan's spatial strategy. As part of undertaking this it is increasingly important for the council to understand the deliverability of sites.

Undertaking call for sites is a regular process the council undertakes and it has been used to inform previous plans such as the Core Strategy and earlier stages of the Policies, Sites and Places Plan (PSP). and West of England Joint Spatial Plan (JSP).

Previously submitted sites, of the types/categories listed below, are available to view on the [online map of sites](#).

- residential development, promoted by landowners/ developers in the last 2 years where they have been supplied with a suitably accurate map; and
- alternative uses (e.g. employment, retail, Gypsies, Travellers, Travelling Showpeople etc.) during the preparation of the Joint Spatial Plan, Policies, Sites and Places Plan and Core Strategy, where they have been supplied with a suitably accurate map by the relevant landowner, agent or developer.

Please note: The inclusion of a site on the call for sites register does not mean that the council in any way supports the development of the site. Sites submitted to the 'Joint Spatial Plan: Towards an Emerging Spatial Strategy' consultation (7 November – 19 December 2016) are being processed and will be added to the map in due course.

### Current consultation

The council invited comments on the new South Gloucestershire Local Plan prospectus from 12 January – 23 February 2017. Details of this consultation can be found at: [www.southglos.gov.uk/newlocalplan](http://www.southglos.gov.uk/newlocalplan).

This was an opportunity, if you have previously submitted a site for inclusion in the call for sites, to review the information shown on the online map (link above) and let us know if the information required updating.

The response form (available for download) should have been used:

- To provide up to date deliverability information, quoting the relevant site reference number(s) from the online map (link above) if the site has previously been submitted to the council; or
- If the site has been submitted on more than one occasion previously (e.g. for other local plan documents, maybe with differing boundaries), please confirm the boundary of the site

you wish to be considered for the new local plan and provide updated delivery information;  
or

- To submit new sites, along with an accurate map of the site boundary.

**For each site please complete a separate form and provide a map that clearly and accurately identifies the site boundary.**

Completed forms and site location plans should have been emailed to:

[PlanningPolicy@southglos.gov.uk](mailto:PlanningPolicy@southglos.gov.uk).

Data Protection Statement: This information is collected by Bath and North East Somerset Council, Bristol City Council, North Somerset Council and South Gloucestershire Council as data controller 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, to contact you, if necessary, regarding the answers given on this form, and to keep you informed of progress with plan making. Some of the data relating to specific sites will 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 form, in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

## Appendix I: Sustainable Access Profiles January 2017

### Sustainable Access Profiles - January 2017

Sustainable Access Profiles provide the following information:

- Basic demographic information for settlements
- The range and number of key services and facilities accessible by walking and cycling from each settlement
- Availability of public transport connections to locations containing key services and facilities
- Maps displaying location of accessible key services and facilities
- Changes and updates including comments received on the Rural Settlements and Villages 2015 Topic Paper (please see bottom of this page)
- A list of key services and facilities within each settlement

The **2017 Sustainable Access Methodology** provides an understanding of how information in the Sustainable Access Profiles was collected and analysed.

Please click the names below to view individual **Sustainable Access Profiles**.

<a href="#">Acton Turville</a>	<a href="#">Coalpit Heath</a>	<a href="#">Frampton Cotterell</a>	<a href="#">Latteridge</a>	<a href="#">Rangeworthy</a>	<a href="#">Tormarton</a>
<a href="#">Almondsbury</a>	<a href="#">Cold Ashton</a>	<a href="#">Hallen</a>	<a href="#">Littleton upon Severn</a>	<a href="#">Redwick</a>	<a href="#">Tytherington</a>
<a href="#">Alveston</a>	<a href="#">Cromhall (Bibstone and Townwell)</a>	<a href="#">Hambrook</a>	<a href="#">Marshfield</a>	<a href="#">Rockhampton</a>	<a href="#">Upton Cheyney</a>
<a href="#">Aust</a>	<a href="#">Doynton</a>	<a href="#">Hawkesbury Upton</a>	<a href="#">Old Down</a>	<a href="#">Rudgeway</a>	<a href="#">West Littleton</a>
<a href="#">Badminton</a>	<a href="#">Dyrham</a>	<a href="#">Hill</a>	<a href="#">Old Sodbury</a>	<a href="#">Severn Beach</a>	<a href="#">Westerleigh</a>
<a href="#">Bitton</a>	<a href="#">Easter Compton</a>	<a href="#">Hinton</a>	<a href="#">Oldbury-on-Severn</a>	<a href="#">Shortwood</a>	<a href="#">Wick</a>
<a href="#">Bridgegate</a>	<a href="#">Elberton</a>	<a href="#">Hortham Village (Lane)</a>	<a href="#">Olveston</a>	<a href="#">Siston</a>	<a href="#">Wickwar</a>
<a href="#">Charfield</a>	<a href="#">Engine Common</a>	<a href="#">Horton</a>	<a href="#">Pilning</a>	<a href="#">Thornbury</a>	<a href="#">Winterbourne</a>
<a href="#">Chipping Sodbury</a>	<a href="#">Falfield</a>	<a href="#">Iron Acton</a>	<a href="#">Pucklechurch</a>	<a href="#">Tockington</a>	<a href="#">Yate</a>

The 2017 Sustainable Access Methodology, and individual Sustainable Access Profiles are available for public consultation, as part of the new Local Plan Prospectus consultation.

Consultation runs from 12 January 2017, and closes on the **23rd of February 2017**.

To comment on the information within the Sustainable Access Profiles or Sustainable Access Methodology please use the response form provided on the [New South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Prospectus document \(January 2017\) page](#) - addressing questions 8 and 9.

### **Previous Consultation**

A Rural Settlements and Villages 2015 Topic Paper, was produced and publicly consulted on in November 2015. Consultation comments received on the 2015 Topic Paper informed the approach to and content of the Sustainable Access Profiles. The 2015 Topic Paper and Appendices have now been superseded and replaced by the information within the 2017 Sustainable Access Profiles,