

A detailed black and white map of Bath and North East Somerset, showing streets, buildings, and landmarks. The map is partially obscured by text boxes.

**Bath & North East
Somerset Council**

Schedule of Minor Modifications to the Submitted Placemaking Plan July 2017

Bath and North East Somerset - *The place to live, work and visit*

Preface

In addition to the Main Modifications the Inspector has concluded in her Report as necessary to make the Placemaking Plan 'sound', it is proposed that that a number of other minor modifications are made to the submitted Plan. Although not necessary for soundness these are recommended for reasons of clarity, consistency and factual accuracy. These minor modifications are set out in the table below and include those consulted on during the Examination in January and February 2017 (identified by the MPC reference in the first column).

Please note that deletions to existing text are shown as ~~strike through~~ and additional text is shown as underlined.

MPC Ref.	Policy/Para	Minor Modification	Reason for the change
VOLUME 1 - DISTRICT-WIDE STRATEGY & POLICIES			
-	Table 4, p.41	<i>Objective 6 & 7 (final column 'Key Strategies & Plans')</i> Air Quality Management Areas for Bath and <u>Keynsham and Saltford</u>	Factual change
-	Table 5, p.50	<i>Objective 6 (final column 'Target')</i> By 2016 within the Bath AQMA, Keynsham AQMA and <u>Saltford AQMA</u> annual average concentrations of Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2) not to exceed 40 ug/m <u>ug/m3</u>	Factual change
MPC1	Para 178, p.80	This approach is consistent with advice in the Planning Practice Guidance which reinforces the controls of other bodies such as the Environment Agency, ensuring that early consideration is given to development proposals that may affect local groundwater quality. Water Source Protection Areas are now more commonly referred to as Source Protection Zones (SPZs) by the Environment Agency who holds all up to date information. <u>The potential impacts of development on groundwater areas beyond the designated zones should also be evaluated as part of a development proposal, in particular principal and secondary aquifers, to ensure there is no unacceptable impact in groundwater quality.</u>	Clarification
-	Policy D.1, p.84	b Development should enrich the character and qualities of places and should contribute positively to locally <u>local</u> distinctiveness	Typographical error

MPC Ref.	Policy/Para	Minor Modification	Reason for the change
-	Para 191, p.86	Policy D.2 sets out the policy on local character and distinctiveness, <u>and</u> designs should respond to an analysis of the place in a positive way.	Minor grammatical amendment
-	Policy D.2, p.86	c The design responds appropriately to urban morphology, including consideration of historic grain – routes, block and plot patterns; mix of uses, building heights, massing	Replace hyphen with a colon for clarity
-	Policy D.3, p.87	<p>Development proposals must contribute positively to the urban fabric, in particular development should be:</p> <p>a Be Ddesigned for ease of walking and cycling and provide safe and high quality routes, ideally providing new green infrastructure;</p> <p>b Be permeable, by offering a choice of routes through a site, and connecting with the existing route networks in and through adjoining areas;</p> <p>c Be Ddelivering perimeter block layouts wherever possible;</p> <p>d Be Dof an appropriate grain, reflecting local character;</p> <p>e Be mixed use particularly at public transport nodes, and at local, district, city and town centres;</p> <p>f Be Ddesigned to maximise natural surveillance of the public realm;</p> <p>g Be Ddesigned with careful consideration of “edges” avoiding blank and inactive frontages. Active internal uses and habitable rooms are required at ground floor level;</p> <p>h Ensure, Wwhere ground floor uses are residential, frontages should also allow for privacy for example incorporating level changes, boundary treatment while maintaining natural surveillance;</p> <p>i Ensure Ddevelopment forms with inactive or blank frontages should be <u>are</u> carefully located, so that they can be wrapped by smaller buildings/active frontages or be placed in locations where at least one edge requires no active frontage. Horizontal mixing with other uses will also be encouraged;</p> <p>j Give careful consideration to the design of corner plots, which should</p>	Amendments to improve the flow and clarity of the policy

MPC Ref.	Policy/Para	Minor Modification	Reason for the change
		<p>incorporate two active frontages;</p> <p>k Create positive micro-climate effects (e.g. avoid pockets of cold, areas of overheating, heat, dazzle, wind or shade);</p> <p>l Be designed to provide continuity of street frontage and for development to relate positively to the street. There should be a clear distinction between backs and fronts of buildings;</p> <p>m Be designed in a way that does not adversely prejudice existing/ future development or compromise adjoining sites.</p>	
-	Policy D.7, p.90 (first part)	<p>Infill development is defined as the filling of a small gap in an otherwise built-up frontage, usually consisting of frontage plots only. Infill development could be supported where:</p> <p>c Infill development on corner plots must gives careful consideration to both the primary and the return frontage in relation to height scale, massing and design and should relates well to the treatment of corner plots within the local context</p>	Amendments to improve the flow and clarity of the policy.
-	Policy D.7, p.90 (second part)	<p>Backland development could be supported where:</p> <p>b It is well related and not inappropriate or in height, scale, mass and form to the frontage buildings</p>	Grammatical correction
-	Para 205, p.91	<p>When drawing up their proposals those seeking planning permission, listed building consent, or consent under the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations should always be advised by the Guidance Notes issued by the Institute of Lighting Professionals and other relevant advice and guidance such as the Bath Lighting Strategy <u>and in the case of historic buildings, 'External Lighting for Historic Buildings' Guidance produced by Historic England.</u></p> <p>If necessary, applicants should seek specialist technical advice from a recognised lighting firm or consultant. Plans which accompany a planning application should demonstrate how this guidance has been taken into account.</p>	Supporting text for Policy D8 to be amended to reflect implications for the historic environment of lighting (Historic England).
-	Policy D8, p.92	1d safety is not compromised in low lit or dark public areas.	Grammatical correction

MPC Ref.	Policy/Para	Minor Modification	Reason for the change
-	Policy D.9, p.94	The following criteria will be used to assess applications for advertisement on commercial premises that requires planning or listed building consent:	Minor amendment to the preamble of Policy D9 to allow the policy to be applied to all applications requiring consent.
MPC2	New para 239a, p.101	<u>The Council will encourage the appropriate management of these heritage assets and those elements most at risk, and will support proposals that seek to conserve and enhance their significance.</u>	Clarification
-	Policy H3, p.146	The sub-division of existing dwellings <u>buildings</u> will be permitted, unless: ii The development does not prejudices the continued commercial use of ground/lower floors.	Editorial to ensure policy title, clauses and supporting text clearly refer to buildings. Minor amendment to clause ii to improve the flow and clarity of the policy without changing its meaning.
-	Policy H5, p.147	Development which would result in the net loss of existing residential accommodation will not be permitted unless, there are benefits that outweigh any harm, such as: i There are demonstrable and substantial conservation benefits ii There are demonstrable and substantial economic, social or environmental benefits iii There are benefits in terms of providing visitor accommodation	Minor amendments to improve the flow and clarity of the policy without changing its meaning.
	Para 388, p. 151	The Council is working to develop an enhanced base to demonstrate local need for accessible housing as part of a cross service project; this may lead to a specific percentage being applied in Policy H8 in relation to market housing. The <u>current evidence in the Housing Accessibility Standards Needs Assessment shows that during the Plan period the newly arising demand for housing meeting enhanced accessibility standards equates to around 19% of all new market housing to be provided. A guidance note to support the operation of Policy H7 has been prepared.</u>	Clarification and factual update.

MPC Ref.	Policy/Para	Minor Modification	Reason for the change
-	Para 403, p.158	Core Strategy Policy RA3 already supports the development of community facilities and shops within and adjoining the rural settlements provided that they are of a scale and character appropriate to the village and meet the needs of the parish and adjoining parishes. Policy LCR2 supports the provision of new community facilities in accessible and sustainable locations.	Amendment to ensure consistency with the changes to Policy RA3 in the Schedule of Limited Changes (March 2016).
-	Para 404, p.158	New community facilities or extensions to existing facilities outside the scope of Policy RA3 <u>and Policy CR4</u> which meet the current and future needs of the local community will be supported provided they are in easily accessible locations and the land and/or building has the capacity to accommodate more than one use or activity.	As Policy RA3 no longer applies to shops, the amendment is to clarify that Policy CR4 applies to the local shops outside the centres identified in Policy CP12.
-	Policy LCR4, p.161	Land as defined on the Policies Map will be safeguarded for extensions to cemeteries at Haycombe, Bath and <u>Ashgrove Cemetery</u> , Eckweek Lane Cemetery , Peasedown St John.	Factual error
-	Policy LCR5, p.163	1 is a surplus of similar facilities in the area and that the loss would not adversely affect the existing and potential recreational needs of the local population, making allowance for the likely demand generated by allocations in this <u>area</u> ;	Typographical error
-	Policy LCR6A, p.166	<p>1 Development that would:</p> <p>conflict with the reasons that the local green space has been demonstrated to be special to the local community and holds a particular local significance; and prejudice its role as Local Green Space will not be permitted unless very special circumstances are demonstrated.</p> <p>2 Local Green Spaces are defined on the Policies Map and additional areas may also be designated as Local Green Space in Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p><i>Policy to be reformatted as:</i></p> <p>1 Development that would conflict with the reasons that the local green space has been demonstrated to be special to the local community and holds a particular local significance; and prejudice its role as Local Green Space will not</p>	Formatting error in printed version - change needed for the policy to make sense.

MPC Ref.	Policy/Para	Minor Modification	Reason for the change
		be permitted unless very special circumstances are demonstrated. 2 Local Green Spaces are defined on the Policies Map and additional areas may also be designated as Local Green Space in Neighbourhood Plans.	
-	Policy LCR7, p.167	Development proposals for the recreational use of waterways and water areas will be permitted provided: 1 there is an overriding need to be in <u>for</u> a waterside location 2 it is <u>they are</u> compatible with established recreational activities 3 it <u>they</u> would not have an unacceptable impact on landscape character, nature conservation interests, amenity value of the area, safety or the highway interests 4 it <u>they</u> would not have a detrimental impact on water quality and supply In the case of development in the Green Belt, proposals should be consistent with national Green Belt policy and not harm the openness of the Green Belt	Amendment to improve the flow of the policy without changing its meaning.
-	Policy LCR7A, p.168	1 the siting and appearance of the proposed apparatus and associated structures minimises impact on the visual amenity, character or appearance of surrounding area	Grammatical correction
-	Para 448, p.169	The purpose of Policy LCR7B therefore is to ensure that new residential and employment development provides for the necessary infrastructure to allow for the implementation of superfast broadband. It is recognised that the availability of such infrastructure may vary across the District. The expectation is that even where such infrastructure is not readily available provision is made for local infrastructure to enable connection when the strategic connections are put in place. This policy approach will complement Core Strategy Policy CP13 which requires that new developments are supported by the timely delivery of infrastructure. Clearly not <u>all</u> proposals will be expected to make provision for broadband infrastructure (e.g. garage proposals). <u>A 'connectivity statement' will help to demonstrate how the proposal will provide access to superfast broadband (24Mbps+) and be compatible with local broadband fibre networks</u>	Clarification

MPC Ref.	Policy/Para	Minor Modification	Reason for the change
		<u>where relevant.</u>	
-	Policy LCR7B	<p>New residential and employment developments should be provided with superfast broadband infrastructure to enable superfast broadband provision and developers and infrastructure providers will be expected to facilitate this through early engagement.</p> <p>Appropriate technology will be identified that will enable the delivery of superfast broadband infrastructure as part of infrastructure planning and should be considered early on as part of a comprehensive utility network plan.</p> <p>Appropriate technology will be identified that will enable the delivery of superfast broadband infrastructure as part of infrastructure planning.</p> <p>Access to superfast broadband (24Mbps+) should be sought, compatible with local broadband fibre networks.</p> <p>Wherever practicable, superfast broadband infrastructure capacity should be incorporated to agreed industry standards.</p> <p>Where it can be demonstrated that such provision would render the development unviable, alternative solutions should be provided as appropriate (such as mobile broadband infrastructure and / or Wi-Fi infrastructure) to enable superfast broadband delivery</p>	Duplicated text deleted.
MPC3	<p>Para 479, p.181</p> <p>Para 480, p.181</p>	<p>Paragraph 51 of the NPPF (March 2012) states that “LPAs “should normally approve {planning applications for change to residential use and any associated development from commercial buildings (currently in the B use classes) where there is an identified need for additional housing in that area, provided that there are not strong economic reasons why such development would be inappropriate”.</p> <p>The term ‘change to’ encompasses both a change of use and redevelopment as ultimately both result in a ‘change to’ the use of land. Residential is defined as development in the C2, C3 and C4 use classes. Residential also encompasses sui generis residential uses such as large HMOs (i.e. blocks of</p>	Minor amends to supporting text to Policy ED.1B for clarification.

MPC Ref.	Policy/Para	Minor Modification	Reason for the change
		student accommodation with shared flats hosting more than 6 persons).	
	Para 481, p.181	What constitutes a 'strong economic reason' is not defined in the NPPF or the PPG and so requires definition in policy locally to enable decision-taking, and the Development Plan for B&NES <u>Core Strategy already</u> includes a very specific policy <u>Policy</u> (B5) to regulate new student accommodation in certain parts of the city.	
	Para 482, p.181	In May 2013, Government amended the GPDO to introduce permitted development rights to enable premises in B1(a) office use (subject to some exclusions including but not limited to listed building and space built since May 2013) to change to C3 dwelling houses (though not C2, C4 or sui generis residential uses) without the need for a planning application, and subject to a prior approval process covering <u>noise</u> , flooding, highways and transport issues and contamination.	
	Para 483, p.181	The most commonly occurring exclusion in B&NES relates to a building being listed <u>buildings</u> . If the building is listed or within the curtilage of a listed building (which is often the case in the centre of Bath), permitted development is not applicable and a planning application is needed. However, the Council considers that the purpose of such an application is to deal with (in addition to the prior approval matters listed above) any risk to the significance of heritage assets and not 'in-principle' issues. The permitted development rights initially lasted until May 2016, <u>but in April 2016, legislation came into force to make this change permanent.</u> after some uncertainty about whether they would be extended, in October 2015 Government announced that the rights would be extended indefinitely.	
	Para 484, p.181	The utilisation of permitted <u>development</u> rights has had a meaningful negative impact on the supply of office space in Bath city centre, including on good quality occupied space. This means that more new office space will be needed than previously proposed when the Core Strategy was adopted. Whilst an expectation of losses was built into the Plan based on trends,	

MPC Ref.	Policy/Para	Minor Modification	Reason for the change
	<p>Para 485, p.181</p> <p>Para 486, p.181</p>	<p>permitted development rights have meant that those expectations have already been exceeded. The gross amount of new office space to be planned for has thus been increased as set out in Core Strategy Policy B1 in order to achieve the necessary net outcome. Making the rights permanent further risks undermining the spatial strategy for the city as a whole and therefore the Council will consider making an Article 4 Direction to remove the rights in specific parts of the District. In 2013 it applied to Government for parts of the District to be exempted as Article 2(5) land but was not successful.</p> <p>The current permitted development rights only apply to a literal 'change of use' (not redevelopment). Currently, proposals for the 'redevelopment' of office space to C3 residential use still require a planning application, which can test in-principle matters (albeit against the background of the NPPF:51). However, in October 2015 Government announced that it intended to extend permitted development rights to redevelopment. The extended rights will enable the demolition of offices and new build as residential use but will be subject to as yet unknown limitations and prior approval tests by the local planning authority. The full details are not yet known. Further, the Council will consider making an Article 4 Direction to remove change of use and redevelopment rights in specific parts of the District. The policies below are written to be sound in the current national planning context and to be flexible enough to be able to respond to changes at a national or local level, without requiring a review of the policy.</p> <p>Proposals for the redevelopment of offices to a C2, C4 or sui generis residential uses do not benefit from permitted development rights and will, in all <u>circumstances the case of non-student C2 & C4 uses</u>, be judged against policy ED.1B. Where a proposal is for student accommodation, Policy B5 of the Core Strategy will also be used in decision-taking.</p>	<p>Incorporates a further minor amendment made for clarification reasons that was not included in MPC3.</p>
MPC4	Policy ED1.B, p.182	POLICY ED.1B - CHANGE OF USE & REDEVELOPMENT OF B1 (A) OFFICE TO RESIDENTIAL USE	Restructuring of policy text for ease of use of the policy and clarification

MPC Ref.	Policy/Para	Minor Modification	Reason for the change
		<p><u>Clause 1</u></p> <p><u>1. Change of use (i.e. conversion)</u></p> <p>a The conversion of office space (B1a) to <u>residential (C3)</u> is normally permitted development, <u>subject to the exceptions set out in the GDPO (which includes listed buildings).</u> <u>The principle of the change of use through conversion of listed buildings in B1a use to C3 residential use is also accepted.</u> and the GDPO sets out circumstances when it is not. Most commonly this circumstance relates to listed buildings. So long as the permitted rights remain in force the LPA will not raise any in principle planning issues in respect of applications for the loss of office space in listed buildings.</p> <p><u>2. Redevelopment (i.e. demolition and construction of a new building)</u></p> <p><u>The redevelopment of office space (B1a) to non-student C2, C3 or C4 residential will be permitted unless there are strong economic reasons for refusal, as set out below.</u></p> <p>b Should this permitted development right be extinguished or removed clauses 2a, 3a and 3b on the redevelopment of office space will also apply to all applications for conversions. Permission will be granted unless both clause 3a and 3b) are met, which would equate to a strong economic reason for refusal</p> <p>Clause 2 a The redevelopment of non-listed office space (B1a) to C3 will be permitted unless both clauses 3a and 3b) are met, which would equate to a strong economic reason for refusal.</p> <p>b If permitted development rights are widened in scope, to include redevelopment, as well as conversion to C3 then this right will take precedence over Clause 2 of this policy c The conversion or redevelopment of office space (B1a) to non-student C2, C4 residential uses, will be normally be approved, unless both clauses 3a and 3b) are met, which would equate to a strong economic reason for refusal</p> <p><u>3. Strong economic reasons</u></p>	

MPC Ref.	Policy/Para	Minor Modification	Reason for the change
		<p><u>Strong economic reasons will exist if:</u></p> <p>Clause 3</p> <p>a i) the space <u>site</u> is within the Bath Central Area, the Bath City Riverside Enterprise Area, Somerdale, or a town centre listed in Policy CP12, or on a site that has been granted permission since 2011; <u>and</u></p> <p>b ii) the loss of the space would be a significant loss to strategically important office accommodation in B&NES and significantly harm the Council's ability to plan positively for economic development.</p> <p>In determining planning applications against clause 3b <u>assessing whether strong economic reasons exist,</u> consideration will be given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>the quality of the office space (existing or permitted) to be lost or not implemented relative compared to alternative, available premises in the locality, and whether these are suitable for any displaced existing occupiers;</u> <u>the need to retain the space in the context of the achievement of strategic Core Strategy targets set out in B1, KE1 and SV1;</u> <u>current market signals and forecasts (to ensure that at any point in time the long term targets of CS policies B1, KE1 and SV1 remain justified throughout the plan period);</u> <u>in the case of a mixed-use residential-led site granted permission since 2011, whether the premises are critical to the sustainability of the permission and whether implementation remains viable, and realistic in light of market signals.</u> <p><u>4. In the event that permitted development rules referred to in this policy no longer apply (whether due to the introduction of a direction under Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning Acts or through changes to national legislation or policy)</u></p> <p><u>a) If the permitted development rules relating to change of use (conversion) from office to residential are removed, all such applications, including for listed</u></p>	

MPC Ref.	Policy/Para	Minor Modification	Reason for the change
		<p><u>buildings, will be assessed using the criteria set out in paragraphs 2-3d, above.</u></p> <p><u>For the avoidance of doubt in these circumstances the principle of the change of use through the conversion of listed buildings in B1a use to C3 use will no longer be automatically considered acceptable.</u></p> <p><u>b) If the permitted development rules relating to change of use (conversion) from office to residential are widened to include redevelopment, consideration of strong economic reasons, as set out in paragraphs 2-3d, above, will no longer be required. This would not apply to listed buildings.</u></p>	
-	Policy ED.2A	<p>1 Proposals for light industrial, heavy industrial, warehousing (classes B1c, B2, B8), builders merchants will be acceptable in principle within the following Industrial Estates identified on the Policies Map. <u>Proposals for</u> car showrooms will also be acceptable on undeveloped land in these areas and where this would not replace B1c and B2 land and premises.</p> <p>2 The identification of these areas as Strategic and Other Primary Industrial Sites means that there is a presumption in favour of retaining them solely for the aforementioned <u>B1c, B2 & B8</u> uses. There are strong economic reasons why other uses would be inappropriate because of the economic significance of these areas.</p>	Clarification
-	Policy RE1, p.191	<p>Proposals for employment uses in the countryside outside the scope of Core Strategy Policies RA1 and RA2 will be permitted providing it is <u>they are</u> consistent with all other relevant policies, and involves:</p> <p>iii it <u>they</u> would not lead to dispersal of activity that prejudices town and village vitality and viability.</p>	Amendments to improve the flow of the policy without changing its meaning
-	Policy RE3, p.193	<p>Proposals for farm diversification involving the use of agricultural land or buildings will be permitted providing:</p> <p>i it is <u>they are</u> consistent with Policy RE5 (protection of high grade agricultural land)</p> <p>ii i <u>they</u> complements the agricultural function of the holding</p>	Amendments to improve the flow of the policy without changing its meaning

MPC Ref.	Policy/Para	Minor Modification	Reason for the change
		<p>iii it <u>they</u> does not compromise the agricultural function of the holding or lead to the fragmentation or severance of a farm holding</p> <p>vi it <u>they</u> does not compromise key ecological function or key habitat integrity</p>	
-	Policy CR1, p.203	<p>Retail and other main town centre uses (including commercial leisure) should be located within the centres identified on the Policies Map and in Core Strategy Policy CP12.</p> <p>Where there are no suitable and viable sites available to meet the needs for such uses within centres, edge of centre locations may be appropriate. Sites should be in a location readily accessible on foot, by cycle and by public transport, with preference given to sites that are well connected to the town centre.</p> <p>Out of centre development of main town centre uses will only be acceptable where:</p> <p>i No suitable or viable centre or edge of centre sites are available and the proposal would be in a location readily accessible on foot, by cycle and by public transport, with preference given to sites that are well connected to the town centre; or</p> <p>ii The proposal is of a small scale (less than 280 sqm gross floorspace), located within <u>the existing urban area of Bath or</u> a settlement with a Housing Development Boundary, and aimed at providing for local needs (refer to Policy CR4).</p> <p>In assessing the availability, suitability and viability of alternative sequentially preferable sites, alternative formats for the proposed uses should be considered. Applicants and the Local Planning Authority should both demonstrate flexibility on format and scale in relation to the form of the proposed development and the consideration of alternative sites.</p> <p>The application of the sequential test should be proportionate and appropriate for the given proposal.</p>	Clarification.

MPC Ref.	Policy/Para	Minor Modification	Reason for the change
		If there are no suitable sequentially preferable locations, the sequential test is passed. In all cases regard should also be given to Policy CR2.	
-	Policy CR4	Outside the centres defined in Core Strategy Policy CP12 and on the Policies Map, proposals for development of appropriately located small-scale local shops (less than 280sqm gross floorspace which provide for local needs) within <u>the existing urban area of Bath or</u> a settlement with a defined Housing Development Boundary will be supported. Proposals over 280sqm gross floorspace will be considered against Policy CR1 and Policy CR2. Proposals for a change of use of an existing small-scale local shop must be supported by a viability assessment to demonstrate that the unit is not capable of continuing in retail use.	Clarification (to be consistent with the supporting text).
-	Para 640, p.222	For all <u>new</u> residential development of any size in the City Centre Zone the parking standard is 0.5 spaces per dwelling. This standard is based on Census 2011 data that shows car ownership levels for those living in central Bath to be 0.5 cars per dwelling.	To clarify that the parking standards apply only to new residential developments not extensions to existing dwellings.
-	Para 651, p.223	Similar to the approach for the Bath Outer Zone, minimum parking standards will be applied to <u>new</u> residential development outside the City of Bath. These are set out in Schedule 1 – Parking Standards at the end of this chapter.	To clarify that the parking standards apply only to new residential developments not extensions to existing dwellings.
-	Schedule 2 – Parking Standards, p.230	C3 Residential Bath and North East Somerset Outside of Bath 1 space per <u>one bed</u> dwelling	Clarification
VOLUME 2 – BATH			
MPC5	Contents page	Page 118 Policy B5 Strategic Policy for Bath's Universities and their impacts on the Housing Market	Clarification

MPC Ref.	Policy/Para	Minor Modification	Reason for the change
-	Policy SB7, p.60	Green Park Station West & Sydenham Park (incorporating: Bath Riverside East: Homebase, and associated car park; Pinesway: Pinesgate offices and the associated road gyratory; Pinesway Industrial Estate. Context This area comprises.....	Superfluous text
-	Policy SB8, p.71	10. Create an appropriate townscape that relates to the scale of the Upper Bristol Road, a <u>this</u> key route into the city, rather than seeking to create a 'gateway' or landmark buildings.	Clarification
-	Policy SB12, p.91	7. Protection on the amenity of neighbouring residential properties.	Grammatical
-	Policy SB13, p.95	Former MoD Ensleigh and Royal High Playing Field (formerly Core Strategy Policy B3c) Development Requirements	Unnecessary wording deleted
-	Para 202, p.98	Planning permission was granted for a replacement car showrooms and workshops at Bath Business Park, Peasedown St. John, in December 2013 and January 2014. These have not yet been implemented yet there is a reasonable prospect that the Newbridge site will be redeveloped in the plan period. While outside the scope of Policy B5 it is considered that this site is required to <u>help</u> deliver the city's 7,000 net additional dwellings and therefore the opportunity cost of developing for student accommodation is considered too great.	Clarification
VOLUME 3 - KEYNSHAM			
-	Diagram 4, p.11	<i>Amend Diagram 4 to distinguish between UK Priority Habitat and Local BAP habitat.</i>	Consequential changes to Diagram 4 to clarify the distinction between UK Priority Habitat and Local BAP habitat as proposed through the Rolling Changes in connection with the amendment to para 271 to include

MPC Ref.	Policy/Para	Minor Modification	Reason for the change
			reference to the Wildthings BAP Post Industrial Sites layer (see CD/PMP/DM29).
-	Diagram 5, p.12	<i>Amend Diagram 5 to distinguish between UK Priority Habitat and Local BAP habitat.</i>	Consequential changes to Diagram 5 to clarify the distinction between UK Priority Habitat and Local BAP habitat as proposed through the Rolling Changes in connection with the amendment to para 271 to include reference to the Wildthings BAP Post Industrial Sites layer (see CD/PMP/DM29).
VOLUME 4 - SOMER VALLEY			
-	Diagram 2, 3 and 4 (pp.10-12)	<i>Amend the Key to Diagrams 2, 3 and 4 as follows:</i> Core Business Areas <u>Strategic and Other Primary Industrial Estates</u> Development Commitment <u>Site Allocation</u>	Clarification
-	Para 19, p.8	Local designations such as Housing Development Boundaries and Core Business Areas <u>Strategic and Other Primary Industrial Estates</u> have been reviewed and are shown on the Policies Map.	Clarification
-	Diagram 6, p.17	<i>Amend Diagram 6 to distinguish between UK Priority Habitat and Local BAP habitat.</i>	Consequential changes to Diagram 6 to clarify the distinction between UK Priority Habitat and Local BAP habitat as proposed through the Rolling Changes in connection with the amendment to para 271 to include reference to the Wildthings BAP Post Industrial Sites layer (see CD/PMP/DM29).

MPC Ref.	Policy/Para	Minor Modification	Reason for the change
-	Diagram 7, p.18	<i>Amend Diagram 7 to distinguish between UK Priority Habitat and Local BAP habitat.</i>	Consequential changes to Diagram 7 to clarify the distinction between UK Priority Habitat and Local BAP habitat as proposed through the Rolling Changes in connection with the amendment to para 271 to include reference to the Wildthings BAP Post Industrial Sites layer (see CD/PMP/DM29).
-	Diagram 9, P.20	<i>Amend the Landscape Setting boundary to match the boundary shown in Diagram 3</i>	Clarification
-	Diagram 13, p.26	<i>Amend the Key to Diagram 13 as follows: Development Commitment <u>Site allocation</u> Junction <u>improvement</u></i>	Clarification
-	Para 82, p.35	8 spaces nominated are designated as Local Green Spaces: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allotments • Charlton Park • Hayes Park <u>Wellow Brook Walk</u> • Hillside Recreational Ground • Holy Ghost Church • Staddlestones • St Chad's Well • Welton Green 	Clarification and accuracy
-	Diagram 20, p.41	<i>Amend the Key to Diagram 20 as follows: Development Commitment <u>Site Allocation</u></i>	Clarification

MPC Ref.	Policy/Para	Minor Modification	Reason for the change
-	Para 156, p.62	Five spaces nominated are designated as Local Green Spaces in Peasedown St John: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecewiche Green Eckweek Lane Play Area Frederick Avenue/Albert Avenue Land between Pippin Close and Russett Way <u>Land on Orchard Way between Frenchfield Road and Russett Way</u> Beacon Hall Play Area <u>Beacon Field Public Open Space</u> 	Clarification
VOLUME 5 - RURAL AREAS			
MPC6	Policy SR5, criterion 9, p.27	POLICY SR5 - PINKERS FARM 9. Any development must take into account all of the lighting needs associated with the development during operational hours and shall be the minimum required to perform the relevant lighting task subject to the requirements of Policy D8.	Clarification
MPC7	Policy SR6, criterion 2, p.29	POLICY SR6 - WATER STREET <i>Amend criterion 1 as follows:</i> About <u>Up to</u> 10 dwellings <i>Delete point 2 as this was superseded by point 3 and should have been deleted.</i> <i>Renumber the remaining principles</i>	Clarification
-	Para 132, p.39	Saltford is in the Avon Valley landscape character area which consists primarily of the meandering River Avon and its wide valley with a generally flat or gently sloping valley floor. The valley sides in Saltford are gently sloping. <u>An Air Quality Management Area has been defined in the village on the A4.</u>	Accuracy
-	Para 165, p.46	The eastern part <u>Land immediately to the east of the allocated site, known as Lansdown Mead,</u> will be protected as a Local Green Space Designation; Lansdown Mead.	Typographical error

VOLUME 6 - APPENDICES			
-	Appx 1, Table 2, p.6	<i>Make it clearer that Policy GDS.1 is the saved policy and only the four sites listed are also saved (not all the GDS.1 sites in the B&NES Local Plan)</i>	Clarity
-	Appx 1, Table 3, p.7	ED.1A Bath Core Office Employment Area Development	Clarification
-	Appx 1, Table 5, p.27	GDS.1 General Development Sites Delete Policy GDS.1 and the following sites from the Policies Map as, unless indicated otherwise below, they have been built:	Clarity
-	Appx 2, Annex 1: CR3, p.50	<i>Amend Policies Map showing Primary Shopping Frontage (Bath) to remove Little Southgate from the proposed Primary Shopping Frontage.</i>	To reflect recent planning permission which shuts this street and replaces the A1 units with A3 restaurants.
-	Appx 2, Annex 1: ST2, p.75	<i>Amend alignment of the Sustainable Transport Route at Old Mills to follow correct route on the ground.</i>	Correct alignment
-	Glossary, p.96	Town Centre Area defined on the local authority's proposal map, including the primary shopping area and areas predominantly occupied by main town centre uses within or adjacent to the primary shopping area. References to town centres or centres apply to city centres, town centres, district centres and local centres (<u>as identified in the hierarchy in Policy CP12</u>) but exclude small parades of shops of purely neighbourhood significance. Unless they are identified as centres in Local Plans, existing out-of-centre developments, comprising or including main town centre uses, do not constitute town centres. [source: NPPF]	Editorial to ensure town centre definition ties back to Policy CP12.