

# Bath & North East Somerset Council

MEETING	<b>Council</b>	
MEETING	<b>23<sup>rd</sup> March 2016</b>	
TITLE:	<b>Submission of the Bath &amp; North East Somerset Placemaking Plan for public examination</b>	
WARD:	All	
<b>AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM</b>		
<b>List of attachments to this report:</b> Appendix 1: Submission B&NES Placemaking Plan Appendix 2: Schedule of limited changes Appendix 3: List of Adopted Core Strategy Policies that will be superseded upon adoption of the Placemaking Plan Appendix 4: Key Issues arising from the consultation on the draft pre-submission plan Appendix 5: Key issues raised in representations by Bath Spa University and the University of Bath		

## 1 THE ISSUE

- 1.1 The Council is preparing the Placemaking Plan which is a statutory planning document. The Plan complements the adopted Core Strategy by setting out detailed planning policies up to 2029. This report seeks Council approval of the Draft Placemaking Plan for submission to the Secretary of State for independent examination.

## 2 RECOMMENDATION

### 2.1 That Full Council

- (1) agree that the B&NES Draft Placemaking Plan (Appendix 1) is submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination;
- (2) agree the list of limited changes in Appendix 2 as part of the submitted plan
- (3) authorise the Divisional Director for Development to present the Council's case at examination;
- (4) invite the Inspector to recommend any modifications which may be necessary to make the Plan sound; and
- (5) agree the Plan for Development Management purposes.

### 3 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (FINANCE, PROPERTY, PEOPLE)

- 3.1 Preparation of the Placemaking Plan is funded from the LDF budget and is resourced by the Planning Policy Team.
- 3.2 Preparation of land-use planning policies will inevitably have an impact on the value of land & buildings, which in turn would impact Council Tax and Business Rates. However, impacts to Council Tax and Business Rates cannot be taken into consideration as part of the assessment and preparation of the Planning Policies.

### 4 STATUTORY CONSIDERATIONS AND BASIS FOR PROPOSAL

- 4.1 The Draft Placemaking Plan has been prepared in compliance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (“the 2004 Act”) and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (“the Regulations”). Once adopted, it will be a statutory Development Plan Document (“DPD”).
- 4.2 Preparation of the Draft Placemaking Plan has also accorded with national policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (“NPPF”) and guidance in the National Planning Practice Guidance (“NPPG”). In particular, the Council has sought to ensure that the plan is sound in that it (inter alia);
  - Has been **positively prepared** – the plan seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits;
  - Is **justified** – the plan is the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
  - Is **effective** – the plan is deliverable; and
  - Is **consistent with national policy** – the plan enables the delivery of sustainable development
- 4.3 The Draft Placemaking Plan has been subject to a fully integrated Sustainability Appraisal (“SA”) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (“SEA”) in line with the requirements of the SEA Regulations (The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004). It has also been subject to an integrated Habitats Regulation Assessment (“HRA”) in line with the requirements of Regulations 102-105 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (the Habitat Regulations).
- 4.4 The Draft Placemaking Plan will be used for Development Management purposes but will not have the full statutory force of section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 until any objections received have been addressed via the examination process and the plan is adopted. In light of the stage of preparation the plan has reached, it will be an important material consideration in the determination of planning applications. Policies with no objections will carry greater weight.
- 4.5 The Housing & Planning Bill 2015 is likely to have implications for some of the policy approaches in both the Placemaking Plan and the Core Strategy but it is premature to seek to pre-empt the Bill’s enactment and so any issues arising will need to be addressed via the examination process.
- 4.6 At the examination, the Inspector will decide whether the Plan is legally compliant. This means whether:

- it is in the current Local Development Scheme (LDS);
- the process of community involvement is in general accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement;
- it complies with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations) 2012;
- the Sustainability Appraisal or Habitat Regulation Assessment Report has been undertaken effectively; and
- it complies with the Duty to Co-operate (DtC)

4.7 The Placemaking Plan provides a district-wide suite of planning policies for B&NES, complementing and delivering the strategic framework in the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy forms Part 1 of the B&NES Local Plan and the draft Placemaking Plan is Part 2. The Plans have been combined for clarity but it is only the Placemaking Plan part which is the subject of this report. In a few instances, some policies/text of the Core Strategy has been amended through the preparation of the Placemaking Plan. These policies or text are intended to supersede the policy or text in the adopted Core Strategy (Regulation 8(5) of the 2012 Regulations). These superseded policies are part of the Placemaking Plan document in Appendix 1 and are also listed in Appendix 3 to this Report.

## 5 THE REPORT

### Background

5.1 The Placemaking Plan is a key Council strategy because it complements the Core Strategy by setting detailed planning frameworks for the district and specific sites and provides planning weight to other Council strategies. The Draft Placemaking Plan was subject to public consultation between 16<sup>th</sup> December 2015 and 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2016. This report outlines the key issues that were raised through the consultation and outlines the next steps in the Placemaking Plan preparation process.

### Representations on the Draft Placemaking Plan

5.2 Through the consultation around 500 representations were submitted on the draft plan. These representations relate to many aspects of the plan. A number of key issues were raised in terms of the plan and/or the number of stakeholders/respondents including those summarised in the schedule attached as Appendix 4. The schedule also highlights the recommended course of action for the Council.

5.3 In considering the issues raised on the draft plan the Council needs to be satisfied that the plan is sound/legally compliant and that it can be submitted for examination. However, the Council may consider that as a result of the representations received limited changes are required.

### Next steps

5.4 The current timetable for the next steps in preparing the Placemaking Plan is set out below. The next step is submission for formal examination.

Council agree to submit Draft Plan for Examination	23 <sup>rd</sup> March 2016
Submission of Plan and supporting documentation to PINS	Mid- April 2016

Examination Hearings	July or September 2016
Receive Inspector's Report	October/November 2016
Adoption	December 2016

5.5 Planning inspectorate guidance on examining local plans makes it clear that any significant changes should preferably be the subject of both a sustainability appraisal and public consultation prior to submission of the plan. Where this is the case the inspector will treat the changes as part of the submitted plan. However, where consultation has not taken place the inspector will determine how to treat them as part of the post-submission pre-hearing stage.

5.6 Any proposed changes to the draft plan will need to be discussed with the Planning Inspectorate. It may be possible for limited changes to be submitted alongside the draft plan without prior public consultation. However, if the council considers that significant changes are needed to the plan, these will need to be subject to a 6 week formal public consultation prior to submission for examination. This would result in a delay to the above timetable. This will substantially delay the adoption to at least the spring of 2017

### Key Issues

5.7 An assessment of the key issues arising from the representations is summarised in Appendix 4 and listed below.

- a Procedural issues
- b Housing supply and allocation of alternative or additional development sites
- c Highways Agency reps re transport issues in Bath
- d Environment Agency issues
- e New Policy LCR3A that residential development will only be permitted where primary school has capacity or can expand is not justified
- f Policy LCR6A on Local Green Spaces
- g Policy ST7: parking standards
- h Historic England concerns
- i Policy H7 Housing standards
- j Policies on to renewable energy; design; environmental issues
- k University Campus expansion
- l Bath – university expansion/student accommodation & HMOs
- m Bath Park & Ride (Policy ST6)
- n Bath (site specific issues)
- o Keynsham sites
- p Somer Valley sites
- q Rural Areas sites

5.8 The most significant issue relates to **housing land supply** and objections seeking the allocation of alternative or additional sites for development. Some argue that the Placemaking Plan should be planning for a greater level of housing development for the following reasons:

- There is a strategic context for significant future housing needs as demonstrated via the Strategic Housing Market Assessment for the Wider Bristol Housing Market Area (West of England Joint Spatial Plan)
- The Core Strategy requirement of 13,000 homes is not a 'cap' and nor are the individual 'policy area' requirements – other suitable/sustainable sites should be allocated in excess of this figure
- The need to better take account of market signals
- The need for more flexibility in the Plan
- Sites identified in SHLAA will not deliver housing as expected

- There is an over reliance on brownfield sites

- 5.9 The District's housing land supply has been reviewed based on an up-to date assessment of commitments and permissions. Whilst there is risk to delivery of some of the sites which are relied upon to deliver the 13,000 core strategy housing requirement, this is offset by other sites forthcoming. It is not considered that the risk is so great as to warrant the identification of new housing sites at this stage and that the appropriate time to review is as set out in the Core Strategy i.e. a 5 year review in 2019/20 to ascertain whether the 13,000 is still the appropriate housing target and whether any changes in the spatial strategy are required to ensure its delivery. A partial review of the Core Strategy will also be undertaken as set out in the Council's Local Development Scheme.
- 5.10 However, it should be noted that there is a risk that the Inspector may conclude differently & require the Council to identify additional sites and subject them to public consultation before he concludes the examination. This will lead to a delay to the adoption of the plan by around 2 or 3 months.
- 5.11 The other key issue arising relates to **student accommodation**. Residents groups consider that the Plan does not adequately control/limit growth of the Universities. They state that the Plan should not include student expansion projections/numbers as these are subject to change and they should be included in a separate Student Accommodation Strategy. Off-campus student accommodation provision should be strictly controlled and further accommodation should be focussed 'on-campus' only. Growth of HMOs needs to be better managed/controlled across the city as a whole e.g. limiting annual growth to a specified number or setting a lower proportion of properties so that HMOs can be limited to specific locations.
- 5.12 In a general sense the Universities and student accommodation providers consider the Plan is too restrictive and that it should better facilitate the changing aspirations and growth of the Universities e.g. through in city capacity or looking at more creative solutions. The University of Bath emphasise that it is a major driver of educational opportunity and economic growth in the City and District, and the Plan's policy framework for Bath should be more flexible in supporting its continued success. The Universities/accommodation providers consider that the Plan should seek to meet student accommodation/university growth as a priority (not sub-ordinate to meeting housing/employment needs) and Policy B5 needs amending to positively enable off-campus provision, particularly outside the Enterprise Area/city centre. Site allocations/Policy B5 should be more flexible in allowing an element of student accommodation on key sites and smaller stand-alone sites e.g. through reference to improving viability.
- 5.13 Both Universities through their representations have updated their growth projections. Whilst for Bath Spa University this means that the number of students in need of accommodation is reduced from that set out in the Draft Plan it should be noted that both Universities only express their projections up to 2020/2021, and the Placemaking plan deals with the period up to 2029. It is considered that the policy framework set out in the Draft Placemaking Plan remains valid and therefore, no changes are recommended at this stage. More detailed analysis of the Universities representations and their implications is set out in Appendix 5.

## Changes

- 5.14 It is considered that no significant changes are required to make the plan sound as a consequence of the public representations. However, issues relating to housing land supply is the most prominent issue that was raised and will be dealt with through the Examination.

- 5.15 In addition to these areas it is considered that some changes of limited scope are required to improve the submitted plan (see Appendix 2). These changes arise primarily from representations by statutory consultees and are limited to the following policies:
- District-wide policies on renewable energy and transport infrastructure proposals to refer to considering impact on heritage assets
  - District-wide design policy to ensure development takes account of local identity and history
  - Policy relating to re-use of rural buildings (including non-designated buildings) to be amended to ensure proposals take account of historic significance/value
  - Policy RA3 to be amended to ensure the policies of the plan as a whole are clearer with respect to considering proposals for shops in villages
  - Policy ST8 (Airport/Aerodrome Safeguarding Areas) – whole of policy needs to be included in the submitted plan

## **6 RATIONALE**

- 6.1 The English Planning system is a Plan-led system. This means that planning applications for development must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The National Planning Policy Framework requires that each Local Authority should produce a Local Plan for its area and emphasises the importance of having it up to date. The Placemaking Plan will be Part 2 of the Local Plan for the Council's area.

## **7 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 7.1 In terms of process, submission of a Local Plan for independent examination is requirement of the 2004 Act and the 2012 Regulations. The Council does not have discretion to depart from this process. The timetable for preparing the plan must accord with the Local Development Scheme.
- 7.2 In deciding its preferred spatial strategy, the Council has assessed the reasonable options. It has chosen the most appropriate strategy in light of the evidence, as guided by the sustainability appraisal.

## **8 CONSULTATION**

- 8.1 Preparation of the Placemaking Plan has entailed extensive community engagement, both formal and informal pursuing a range of consultation and engagement methods as set out in the [Neighbourhood Planning Protocol](#) (the Council's Statement of Community Involvement).
- 8.2 The Placemaking Plan Launch document was published for consultation in July 2013 and the Options document was published for consultation in November 2014. Around 1,000 comments were received each on the Launch document and Options document.
- 8.3 Alongside these more formal consultations, the Council has continued to work closely with the Town and Parish Councils, community groups, local representatives and latterly the Bath City Forum in order to draw up a policy framework which takes into account local aspirations and concerns. The Council has also liaised with statutory consultees (such as Historic England, Natural England and the Environment Agency) as necessary to address any issues raised. This front loaded approach is aimed at resolving as many issues as possible early in the

process in the preparation of the Placemaking Plan and it is underpinned by evidence to ensure the Plan is 'sound' when submitted for Examination.

- 8.4 The consultation on the Draft Placemaking Plan between December 2015 and February 2016 was formal and focussed. Consultees were invited to comment on whether the Draft Placemaking Plan meets the four tests of 'soundness' (positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy) and is legally compliant as required by the NPPF para 182. The broad programme of engagement activities previously undertaken as part of the Placemaking Plan Launch document and Options document consultation by virtue of Regulation 18 of the Regulations was not repeated at this stage.
- 8.5 The publication of the Plan for consultation is prescribed in Regulation 19 of the Regulations which entails making the Draft Placemaking Plan and other documents publicly available together with formal notification of Consultees. Nevertheless the Council also publicised the consultation on the Draft Placemaking Plan more widely and in line with the Neighbourhood Planning Protocol. Consultation on the Draft Plan resulted in around 700 representations being submitted.
- 8.6 The Council's Monitoring Officer, section 151 Officer and the Place Strategic Director have had the opportunity to input to this report and have cleared it for publication.

### **EQUALITY ACT 2010**

- 8.7 Duties are placed upon the Council by the above legislation including in relation to the Section 149 Public Sector Equality Duty. These duties have been fully recognised by officers in the preparation of the Draft Placemaking Plan.

### **HUMAN RIGHTS**

- 8.8 The Draft Placemaking Plan has been prepared in accordance with a statutory process which has included extensive consultation and Council is being asked to submit the plan for examination by an independent Planning Inspector. It is therefore considered that it is unlikely that this would involve any direct interference with any individual's human rights.

## **9 RISK MANAGEMENT**

- 9.1 A risk assessment related to the issue and recommendations has been undertaken, in compliance with the Council's decision making risk management guidance.

<b>Contact person</b>	<i>Lisa Bartlett 01225 477550, Simon de Beer 01225 477616</i>
<b>Background papers</b>	<p><i>Key Policy</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>B&amp;NES Core Strategy 2014</i></li> <li>• <i>National Planning Policy Framework</i></li> <li>• <i>National Planning Practice Guidance</i></li> <li>• <i>Extant Supplementary Planning Documents – such as the Planning Obligations SPD, HMO in Bath SPD, Sustainable Construction &amp; Retrofitting SPD etc.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Other Key Council Policy</i></p>

- *B&NES Economic Strategy*
- *B&NES Housing & Well-being Strategy*

*Evidence Base supporting Draft Placemaking Plan, available via the link below:*

[http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Placemaking-Plan/draft\\_pmp\\_evidence\\_base.pdf](http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Placemaking-Plan/draft_pmp_evidence_base.pdf)

**Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format**



## APPENDIX 1: SUBMISSION PLACEMAKING PLAN

The Draft Placemaking Plan can be found at the link below:

<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/services/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/placemaking-plan/placemaking-plan-pre>

## APPENDIX 2: SCHEDULE OF LIMITED CHANGES

Note: in the changes below additional text is underlined and deletions are shown as a strike through.

Volume	Plan ref	Change	Reason
1	Policy RA3	<p><del>POLICY RA3 COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SHOPS</del></p> <p>Proposals for the development of community facilities <del>or shops</del> will be acceptable within and adjoining all villages, provided that they are of a scale and character appropriate to the village and meet the needs of the parish and adjoining parishes.</p>	In order to ensure Policy RA3 and Policy CR4 provide a clear policy framework in accordance with the NPPF
1	Policy SCR4	<p><b>POLICY SCR4: COMMUNITY RENEWABLE ENERGY SCHEMES</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The positive benefits of community energy schemes will be a material consideration in assessing renewable energy development proposals.</li> <li>2. The preference is for schemes that are led by and directly meet the needs of local communities, in line with the hierarchy and project attributes below: Community Led Energy:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Project part or fully owned by a local community group or social enterprise</li> <li>b) Local community members have a governance stake in the project or organisation e.g. with voting rights</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. In the case of renewable energy proposals within the Green Belt, where community benefits are proposed to meet the “very special circumstances” test, the following criteria will be considered:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The contribution to achieving the targets set out in Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy to increase the level of renewable electricity and heat generation in the district;</li> <li>b) The contribution that will be made to local and national renewable energy and carbon reduction targets;</li> <li>c) Social and economic benefits. For example, local job creation opportunities; raising the quality of life in rural areas through diversification of agricultural land and generating an alternative income for farmers;</li> <li>d) The temporary nature of the renewable energy development and the ability to restore land to its original condition at the end of the project’s life;</li> <li>e) Contributions to improving the biodiversity, public amenity and soils in the vicinity of the scheme.</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. <u>In all cases schemes will only be permitted if there is no unacceptable impact on the significance of a designated and non- designated heritage asset.</u></li> </ol>	New clause (4) added to ensure that the impact on heritage and environmental assets is a key consideration in any community led renewable energy schemes requiring planning permission (Historic England).

1	Policy D1	<p><b>POLICY D.1: GENERAL URBAN DESIGN PRINCIPLES</b></p> <p>The following general design principles will be applied, particularly for large scale development proposals or Masterplans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Places should be designed for people – to be safe, comfortable, varied and attractive. They should offer opportunities for interaction and delight.</li> <li>b) Development should enrich the character and qualities of places and should contribute positively to locally distinctiveness, <u>identity and history</u>.</li> <li>c) Development should make connections – by foot, cycle, public transport and by car – in that order. Streets and Spaces must be legible and easy to move around.</li> <li>d) Development should work with the landscape structure and should contribute positively to the characteristics of the settlement</li> <li>e) Places should be mixed use and should respond to context</li> <li>f) Buildings and spaces must be flexible and adaptable</li> <li>g) Buildings and spaces should be designed to be energy efficient (e.g. consider natural light and passive heating and cooling)</li> </ul> <p>Developments that reflect these general urban design principles will be supported.</p>	Amend clause b. to ensure the policy wording better accords with the NPPF (Historic England).
1	Policy D8	<p><b>POLICY D.8: LIGHTING</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Proposals for artificial lighting will only be permitted where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) they would not give rise to an unacceptable level of illumination into the sky, open countryside, urban areas or villages;</li> <li>b) it can be demonstrated that additional lighting on site will have no detrimental impact on visual and residential amenity, <u>the historic environment</u> or local ecology;</li> <li>c) any adverse impact of lighting proposals in all new development, including light spill and energy use, is minimised through design or technological solutions (including the use of SMART lighting techniques) or by controlling the hours of use;</li> <li>d) safety is not compromised in low lit or dark public area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2) Development will be expected to reduce or at best maintain existing light levels to protect or improve the darkness of rivers, watercourse or other ecological corridors in particular to protect or provide a functional dark route for European protected species. New external lighting facilities with light spill to these features must be dimmable.</li> </ul> <p>Lighting in public areas should be designed to a suitable level of illumination in accordance with BS 5489-1 2013 and where appropriate, ensure consistency with Bath Lighting Strategy and <u>other relevant guidance</u> and where necessary the hours of operation will be controlled by the use of</p>	Amend clause b. to ensure the policy wording better accords with the NPPF (Historic England).

		conditions.	
1	Policy HE1	<p>POLICY HE1: HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT</p> <p><u>Safeguarding Heritage Assets</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Within the scope of Core Strategy Policies B4 and CP6, development that has an impact upon a heritage asset, whether designated or non-designated, will be expected to enhance or better reveal its significance and/or setting, and make a positive contribution to its character and appearance.</li> <li>2) The District's historic environment shall be sustained and enhanced. This includes all heritage assets including the Bath World Heritage Site, historic buildings, conservation areas, historic parks and gardens, landscape, archaeology and townscapes of importance.</li> <li>3) <del>Development affecting a designated or non-designated heritage asset and its setting will be expected to make a positive contribution to its character, appearance and significance.</del></li> <li>4) Applications affecting the significance of any heritage asset will be required to provide sufficient information to demonstrate how the proposals would contribute to the asset's conservation.</li> <li>5) The Historic Environment Record, including Conservation Area Character Appraisals and Management Plans will be used to inform the consideration of future development including potential conservation and enhancement measures.</li> <li>6) Great weight will be given to the conservation of the District's heritage assets. Any harm to the significance of a designated or non-designated heritage asset must be justified. Proposals will be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal; whether it has been demonstrated that all reasonable efforts have been made to sustain the existing use, find new uses, or mitigate the extent of the harm to the significance of the asset; and whether the works proposed are the minimum required to secure the long term use of the asset.</li> <li>7) If such harm can be fully justified, where relevant the Council will require archaeological excavation and/or historic building recording as appropriate, followed by analysis and publication of the results.</li> <li>8) In addition, the following will apply to specific asset types as listed below: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <u>City of Bath World Heritage Site</u> Development within the City of Bath City World Heritage Site will be expected to comply with Policy B4 of the Core Strategy and all other relevant supplementary information and guidance; and help support the delivery of the World Heritage Site Management Plan.</li> <li>b) <u>Listed buildings</u></li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Criteria 1) and 3) combined to help streamline the policy for effectively (Historic England).

		<p>The significance of listed buildings is required to be sustained and enhanced. Appropriate repair and reuse of listed buildings will be encouraged.</p> <p>Alterations, extensions or changes of use, or development in their vicinity, will be expected to have no adverse impact on those elements which contribute to their special architectural or historic interest, including their settings.</p> <p>c) <u>Conservation Areas</u></p> <p>Development, including any proposed demolition, within or affecting the setting of a conservation area will only be permitted where it will preserve or enhance those elements which contribute to the special character or appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>The Council will look for opportunities from new development within conservation areas and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance.</p> <p>d) <u>Archaeology</u></p> <p>Scheduled monuments and other non-designated archaeological sites of equivalent significance should be preserved in situ. In those cases where this is not justifiable or feasible provision should be made for their excavation and recording. The appropriate publication and curation of the finds/archive will be required.</p> <p>e) <u>Registered Historic Parks and Gardens</u></p> <p>Development will be expected to respect the design, character, appearance and settings of registered historic parks and gardens and to safeguard those features which contribute to their significance and are integral to their character and appearance.</p> <p>f) <u>Lansdown Registered Historic Battlefield</u></p> <p>Development will be expected to respect the character, appearance and setting of the Lansdown battlefield, safeguarding those features which contribute to its significance.</p> <p>g) <u>Non-designated heritage assets</u></p> <p>Proposals affecting non-designated heritage assets, including unscheduled archaeology, unlisted buildings and local parks and gardens, should ensure they are conserved having regard to their significance.</p>	
1	Policy HE2	<p><b>POLICY HE2: SOMERSETSHIRE COAL CANAL AND THE WANSDYKE</b></p> <p>Development adversely affecting the physical remains and/or historic routes of the Wansdyke or Somersetshire Coal Canal, as defined on the Policies Map, and/or their setting, will not be permitted unless it can demonstrate appropriate mitigation and/or enhancement consistent with Policy HE2.</p>	<p>Amend Policy HE2 to cross refer to Policy B3a (Historic England).</p>

		For the section of the Wansdyke lying within the Land adjoining Odd Down, Bath Strategic Site Allocation, Policy B3a will also apply.	
1	Policy RE6	<p><b>POLICY RE6: RE-USE OF RURAL BUILDINGS</b></p> <p>Conversion of a building or buildings to a new use in the countryside outside the scope of Policies RA1, RA2 and GB2 will only be permitted, provided:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) its form, bulk and general design is in keeping with its surroundings and respects the style and materials of the existing building</li> <li>2) the building is not of temporary or insubstantial construction and not capable of conversion without substantial or complete reconstruction or requires major extension</li> <li>3) the proposal would enhance visual amenity and not harm ecological function (e.g. bat roost)</li> <li>4) the proposal does not result in the dispersal of activity which prejudices town or village vitality and viability</li> <li>5) where the building is isolated from public services and community facilities and unrelated to an established group of buildings the benefits of re-using a redundant or disused building and any enhancement to its immediate setting outweighs the harm arising from the isolated location</li> <li>6) the development would not result, or be likely to result, in replacement agricultural buildings or the outside storage of plant and machinery which would be harmful to visual amenity;</li> <li>7) in the case of buildings in the Green Belt, does not have a materially greater impact than the present use on the openness of the Green Belt or would conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt.</li> <li>8. <u>The integrity and significance of buildings and farmsteads of architectural and historic interest and of communal, aesthetic and evidential value are safeguarded consistent with Policy HE1</u></li> </ol>	To ensure that the architectural and historic interest of rural farm buildings and farmsteads not formally designated are recognised and their integrity and significance are safeguarded (Historic England).
1	ST1	<p><b>POLICY ST1: PROMOTING SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL</b></p> <p>In order to ensure delivery of well-connected places accessible by sustainable means of transport, planning permission will be permitted provided the following principles are addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) reduce the growth and the overall level of traffic and congestion by measures which encourage movement by public transport, bicycle and on foot, including traffic management and assisting the integration of all forms of transport;</li> <li>2) reduce dependency on the private car;</li> <li>3) give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, and have access to high quality public transport facilities;</li> <li>4) provide and enhance facilities for pedestrians, cyclists</li> </ol>	Include additional clause to accord with national policy for the historic environment (Historic England).

		<p>and the mobility impaired including segregated provision that is fit for purpose;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5) safeguard, enhance and extend the network of public rights of way and cycle routes;</li> <li>6) reduce the adverse impact of all forms of travel on the natural and built environment;</li> <li>7) ensure development does not prejudice the efficient functioning and acceptable development of the railway network;</li> <li>8) promote the use of car clubs and electric cars;</li> <li>9) ensure access to high quality public transport facilities is achieved by improving existing and providing new public transport facilities which would increase the proportion of journeys made by public transport; <del>and</del></li> <li>10) support and promote measures which reduce the levels of traffic pollution in the interests of improving health and quality of life and reducing harmful impacts on the built and natural environment; <u>and</u></li> <li>11) <u>Schemes should safeguard affected heritage assets and the historic environment.</u></li> </ol>	
1	ST3	<p><b>POLICY ST3: TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE</b></p> <p>Within the context of Core Strategy Policy CP6(1) the development of transport infrastructure will only be permitted provided that the following requirements have been met:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is no unacceptable impact on <u>heritage and environmental assets</u> including the World Heritage Site and its setting, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Natura 2000 sites (SACs/SPA);</li> <li>2. The visual and functional impact of the scheme and any associated surface treatment, street furniture, signing, road markings, roadside verges and lighting upon the character of the area is minimised;</li> <li>3. The impact of noise and other forms of pollution on surrounding land uses from traffic likely to be generated by the proposal is minimised;</li> <li>4. The needs of pedestrians including those with impaired mobility, cyclists and horseriders are met;</li> <li>5. The need for provision in appropriate cases of street furniture which aids security of premises without adversely affecting pedestrian circulation;</li> <li>6. The environmental benefits to be secured through implementation of the scheme and any additional traffic management or calming measures needed to maximise those benefits should be clearly articulated;</li> <li>7. The quality, patronage and efficiency of public transport operations must not be compromised;</li> <li>8. The response time of emergency services must not be compromised; and</li> <li>9. The acceptable provision for the transportation of</li> </ol>	<p>Change made to clause 1 to acknowledge the relevance of considering all heritage assets and not just the World Heritage Site (Historic England).</p>

		<p>materials to and from the site or disposal of spoil during construction.</p> <p>All highway infrastructure will be required to comply with national guidance and standards set out in 'Manual for Streets', 'Manual for Streets 2 - wider application of the principles', the 'Design Manual for Roads and Bridges' and any subsequent updates to these documents.</p>	
1	ST6	<p>POLICY ST6: PARK AND RIDE</p> <p>1) Development of new or expansion of existing Park and Ride sites will be permitted provided:</p> <p>(a) that there is no unacceptable impact on environmental <u>and heritage</u> assets and amenity including the World Heritage Site and its setting, the Cotswolds AONB and Natura 2000 sites (SACs/SPA);</p> <p>(b) that there is no unacceptable impact on surrounding road network and its capacity to safely accommodate potential traffic generation; and</p> <p>(c) provision is made for the needs of those with impaired mobility and for the safety and security of all users; and</p> <p>(d) in the case of Park and Ride development in the Green Belt, it can as necessary be demonstrated that there are not any more suitable or more sustainable alternative sites outside the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land in it.</p> <p>2) Applicants will also be required to demonstrate that the scheme complies with all other relevant national and local planning policies that affect the site and its location.</p>	<p>Change made to clause 1a) to acknowledge the relevance of considering all heritage assets and not just the World Heritage Site (Historic England).</p>
1	Policy ST8	<p>POLICY ST8: AIRPORT AND AERODROME SAFEGUARDING AREAS</p> <p>Within the airport/aerodrome safeguarding areas as defined by the Civil Aviation Authority as shown on the Policies Map any development that would prejudice air safety or adversely affect the operational integrity of an aerodrome or airport <u>will not be permitted.</u></p>	<p>Final part of the policy omitted from published Draft Plan in error.</p>
1	M5	<p><i>Replace term 'Energy Minerals' with 'Conventional and Unconventional Hydrocarbons'</i></p>	<p>Replace all references in the Plan to Energy Minerals' with 'Conventional and Unconventional Hydrocarbons' to align with national policy (Coal Authority).</p>



**APPENDIX 3: LIST OF CORE STRATEGY POLICIES THAT WILL BE SUPERSEDED  
ON ADOPTION OF THE PLACEMAKING PLAN**

- B1 Bath Spatial Strategy**
- B3 Strategic Policy for Twerton and Newbridge Riverside**
- B5 Strategic Policy for Bath's Universities**
- KE2 Town Centre/Somerdale Strategic Policy**
- SV1 Somer Vale Spatial Strategy**
- SV2 Midsomer Norton Town Centre Strategic policy**
- RA1 Development in the Villages meeting the listed criteria**
- RA2 Development in Villages outside the Green Belt not meeting Policy RA1  
Criteria**
- CP4 District Heating**
- CP7 Green Infrastructure**
- CP12 Centres and Retailing**

**APPENDIX 4: SCHEDULE OF KEY ISSUES RAISED THROUGH CONSULTATION ON  
DRAFT PLACEMAKING PLAN**

No.	Plan ref	Respondents	Issue	Recommended Action
a	Whole Plan	Various developers	<p>Plan preparation process/scope:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combining Core Strategy &amp; Placemaking Plan at this stage and amending some parts of Core Strategy has resulted in a disjointed document and confusion as to what is being consulted upon and how this relates to the Local Development Scheme and/or some assuming all of the Core Strategy is available for comment</li> <li>• SA is inadequate</li> <li>• Duty to cooperate statement has not been produced – legal compliance issue</li> <li>• Consultation documents changed during consultation period and respondents not all advised – process therefore, flawed</li> <li>• Maps included in Appendices not all at a scale where boundary changes/new boundaries are clear</li> <li>• Major &amp; minor textual errors in Plan, including missing part of Policy ST8, that need to be corrected</li> </ul>	<p>Relationship between Core Strategy &amp; Placemaking Plan to be clearly articulated for the Inspector.</p> <p>DtC statement to be prepared.</p> <p>Note on consultation process to be prepared for Inspector.</p> <p>Include whole of Policy ST8 in schedule of focussed changes to submit alongside the Plan.</p>
b	District-wide strategy/ housing supply and place based sections	Various developers/ land owners	<p>Housing land supply and allocation of alternative or additional sites for development:</p> <p>Developers have raised the following issues in suggesting that the Placemaking Plan should be planning for a greater level of housing development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• strategic context of very significant future housing needs as demonstrated via SHMA for Wider Bristol HMA (JSP)</li> <li>• impending related review of the B&amp;NES CS's housing requirement</li> <li>• Core Strategy requirement of 13,000 homes is not a 'cap' and nor are the individual 'policy area' requirements – other suitable/sustainable sites should be allocated in excess of this figure</li> <li>• need to better take account of market signals</li> <li>• need more flexibility in the Plan</li> <li>• sites identified in SHLAA will not deliver housing as expected</li> <li>• over reliance on brownfield sites</li> </ul> <p>In order to address these issues a range of sites are proposed for allocation (mainly in Keynsham and Somer Valley), including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uplands, Keynsham</li> <li>• Land west of Keynsham (around 200 dwellings to contribute towards local need and strategic requirement identified via JSP)</li> <li>• Broadleaze Nursery, east of Keynsham (to meet local housing need, in particular for affordable housing)</li> <li>• Larger scale development between</li> </ul>	<p>The housing land supply based on the most recent progress in bringing forward sites has been reviewed. It is concluded that there is risk to delivery of some of the sites which are relied upon to deliver the 13,000 core strategy housing requirement, but this is offset by other sites forthcoming. It is not considered that the risk is so great as to warrant the identification of new housing sites at this stage and that the appropriate time to review is as set out in the Core Strategy i.e. a 5 year review in 2019/20 to ascertain whether the 13,000 is still the appropriate housing target and whether any changes in the spatial strategy are required to ensure its delivery. However, it should be noted that there is a risk that the Inspector may conclude differently &amp; require the Council to identify additional sites, subject them to public consultation before he concludes the exam. This will lead to a delay to the adoption of the plan by at least around 2 to 3 months.</p>

			<p>Keynsham and Saltford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allocate/develop safeguarded land to east of Keynsham now</li> <li>• Rymans Engineering, Radstock</li> <li>• Land North of Kilmersdon Road, Manor Farm, Haydon, Radstock</li> <li>• Land parallel with Five Arches Greenway, Radstock</li> <li>• Land at Tynning Hill, Radstock</li> <li>• Land off Bath Old Road, Radstock</li> <li>• Land at Smallcombe Road, Clandown, Radstock</li> <li>• Rear of 46 Radstock Road, Midsomer Norton</li> <li>• Land to east of Church Road, Peasedown</li> <li>• Paulton Printing Works (releasing Care Retirement Community land)</li> <li>• Land north of Temple Inn Lane, Temple Cloud</li> <li>• Land at Wells Road, Hallatrow</li> <li>• Former Garden Nursery, Temple Cloud</li> </ul>	
c	Whole plan & spatial strategy	Highways England	Generally supportive of the spatial strategy and site allocations and promotion of sustainable means of transport. Potential concern around amount of development within Bath, particularly focussed in the Enterprise Area, and potential for negative impact on strategic road network. Need to ensure all necessary transport infrastructure measures are identified in the Placemaking Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Programme.	No change – further work being undertaken prior to Examination
d	Whole plan	Environment Agency	Generally supportive of the Plan with regard to environmental issues and specifically flood risk/implementation of the sequential approach, taking account of climate change, and associated policy/site requirements. Some broad suggestions that the Plan could be improved through the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• cross references to flood emergency planning/response</li> <li>• include references to pertinent regulatory frameworks in relation to water supply/quality</li> <li>• greater prominence to considering water source protection across the District</li> <li>• cross references to national guidance on contamination assessments</li> <li>• review nature conservation policies (which are supported by EA) in context of national biodiversity toolkit</li> </ul>	No changes to Plan at this stage required for soundness – consider issues at Examination and whether minor changes to improve the Plan could be made
e	Policies RA1 & RA2 (rural strategy )	Various developers	Changes to Policy RA1 (reference to requirement for a primary school) & inclusion of Policy LCR3A stating that residential development will only be permitted where primary school has capacity or can expand is not justified/in accordance with the NPPF and will negatively affect housing delivery in the rural areas and may mean Core Strategy requirements for rural areas cannot be met.	No change – consider issues through Examination
f	Policy LCR6A and specific Local Green	Landowners and residents	Local Green Space (LGS) - The process of and approach to designating LGS in terms of the application/interpretation of the NPPF is questioned i.e. has the Council designated LGS that is 'demonstrably special' and meets the criteria?	No change – consider issues through Examination

	Spaces		<p>Many representations relating to individual spaces:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposing previously nominated or new spaces should be designated, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Beechen Cliff school</li> <li>land at Breaches Gate East Keynsham</li> <li>land south of Staddlestones, Midsomer Norton</li> <li>LGS18 designation (land at Whitelands/Tynning, Radstock) should be extended to include all land referred to as the “Green batch”</li> </ul> </li> <li>Proposing new spaces for designation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>undeveloped land on northern part of University of bath campus</li> </ul> </li> <li>Proposing that designated spaces should not be designated, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Millers Walk, Bathampton</li> <li>Adj. Bramble Cottage, Farmborough</li> <li>Parkers Mead, East Harptree</li> <li>Land south of Lower Road, Hinton Blewett</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	
g	Policy ST7: parking standards	Various, including developers & FOBRA	<p>Parking standards - implications of changing approach to parking standards not adequately tested e.g. in terms of traffic generation, especially in Bath. Need to ensure Parking Standards support delivery of Bath Transport Strategy. Sharp distinction between inner and outer parking areas in Bath is unacceptable as results in major difference in standards either side of boundary line within the Enterprise Area. Zero parking standard for student accommodation unacceptable as Universities also discourage car parking/use.</p>	No changes to the Plan should be made at this stage. Issues to be considered through Examination.
h	District-wide Policies SCR2-4, D1 & D6, RE6, HE1 & 2, ST1,3 & 6	Historic England	<p>In order to closely accord with the NPPF the Plan’s policies relating to renewable energy development; design; re-use of rural buildings; and transport infrastructure should be amended to refer to considering and mitigating impact on heritage interests &amp; assets.</p>	Make limited changes to some Policies (see Appendix 2) – submit alongside Draft Plan
i	Policy H7 (Housing standards)	Registered Housing Providers & other developers	<p>Housing Accessibility &amp; Space Standards for affordable housing have been inappropriately ‘passported’ into the Planning Obligations SPD. The application of standards to both affordable and market housing needs to be robustly evidenced (in terms of need and viability).</p>	No change – further work being undertaken prior to submission/ Examination
j	District-wide Policies, including those relating to renewable energy; design; environ	Various	<p>Variety of issues raised on District-wide Development Management policies – developers consider some policies too prescriptive/restrictive and not in line with NPPF, others consider some aspects of policies require definitions and clarification.</p>	No change – consider issues through Examination

	mental issues			
k	Bath - strategy	FOBRA and other stakeholders	<p>The strategy should be more explicitly articulated and clearer regarding the limits to University expansion i.e. housing and employment spaces are the first priority; retail and hotel developments are a lower priority; and the expansion of the universities for academic and student accommodation should be limited to on-campus development within the existing site boundaries without any further intrusion into the Green Belt and the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>Others consider the strategy fails to meet needs/demands that it should prioritise e.g. for student accommodation, key worker housing, HMOs.</p>	No change – consider issue through Examination
l	Bath – university expansion/ student accommodation	Universities FOBRA, student accommodation providers and residents	<p>Approach of the Plan to University expansion, provision of student accommodation and implications for the city:</p> <p><u>Universities/student accommodation providers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the Plan is too restrictive and that it should better facilitate changing aspirations of Universities e.g. through looking at more creative solutions</li> <li>• University of Bath is a major driver of educational opportunity and economic growth in the City and District, and the Plan should play a critical role in supporting its continued success</li> <li>• The Plan should be based on meeting student accommodation/university growth as a priority (not sub-ordinate to meeting housing/employment needs) and Policy B5 needs amending to positively enable off-campus provision, particularly outside EA/city centre</li> <li>• Site allocations/Policy B5 should be more flexible in allowing an element of student accommodation on key sites and smaller stand-alone sites e.g. through reference to improving viability</li> </ul> <p><u>FOBRA/various residents</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the Plan does not adequately control/limit growth of the Universities</li> <li>• The Plan should not include student expansion projections/numbers as these are subject to change – they should be included in a separate Student Accommodation Strategy</li> <li>• Off-campus student accommodation provision should be strictly controlled and further accommodation should be focussed on-campus only</li> <li>• Growth of HMOs needs to be better managed/controlled across the city as a whole e.g. limiting annual growth to a specified number or setting a lower proportion of properties that can be HMOs tailored to specific locations</li> </ul>	No change – consider issues through Examination
m	Bath Park &	Various, including	A clear and robust case for East of Bath P&R (considered alongside and related to other	No change to the Plan. Collate relevant evidence on P&R and

	Ride (Policy ST6)	Historic England, FOBRA and BPT	transport measures) needs to be set out and the impact of a P&R on all heritage assets will need to be thoroughly assessed (including using the ICOMOS guidance). Policy on P&R should better reflect need to balance protection of Green Belt/AONB against public benefits of P&R including to WHS through removing traffic. Less specific references to Park & Ride as being the solution to transport problems in the city should be made, thereby enabling other solutions further out from the city e.g. park & link to be considered.	other East of Bath transport measures for submission and discussion at Examination.
n	Bath (site specific issues)	Various stakeholders, including developers & land owners	Range of specific issues raised on sites allocated for development. Key issues raised include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SB2 (the Rec) – should make clear that additional car parking should not form part of development on this site</li> <li>• SB4 (Quays North) – should make provision for hotel uses and cultural/arts venue. Alternative solution for coach parking/drop needs to be identified.</li> <li>• SB7 (Sydenham Park/Green Park station) – policy too prescriptive in terms of uses and the design principles are too onerous. Sainsbury's supportive of option involving their relocation but only if they stay on the wider site</li> <li>• SB8 (Westmark part of Western Riverside) &amp; SB16 (Burlington Street) – policies should allow for student accommodation</li> <li>• SB11 (MoD Foxhill) – concern about impact of development on AONB</li> </ul>	
o	Keynsham	Various residents & developers	Issues include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to ensure re-provided Leisure Centre meets current/future needs</li> <li>• Infrastructure, including transport network, unable to cope with new development – ensure specific transport improvements identified &amp; delivered</li> <li>• Site specific issues e.g. employment floorspace in Somerdale and refer to Broadmead Peninsula opportunities</li> </ul>	No change – consider issues through Examination
p	Somer Valley	Various residents & developers	Issues include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vision for Radstock – refer to Radstock-Frome railway</li> <li>• Policy SV1 too restrictive by limiting housing to within HDB</li> <li>• Objection to safeguarded land for educational purposes at Norton Hill as undeliverable and land at White Post (in association with housing development) being pursued by Education Funding Authority</li> <li>• Enterprise Zone references need to be accurate</li> <li>• Site specific issues e.g. policy requirements for Old Mills allocation and Welton Bibby &amp; Baron site and Former St. Nicholas Primary School</li> </ul>	No change – consider issues through Examination
q	Rural Areas	Various residents, developers &	Issues raised are primarily site specific. Key issues include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timsbury - land East of St Mary's Primary</li> </ul>	No change – consider issues through Examination

		Parish Councils	<p>School (SR15) – potential for access improvements to the school should be better facilitated as this was one of the major reasons for allocating the site. Extent of development area shown and dwelling capacity is too great; need to protect more land as LGS and concern about loss of views/viewing point; harm to rural character; and dangerous access onto North Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timsbury – land south of Loves Hill should have been allocated as more suitable/less constrained than SR15 and enables housing needs to be met (also subject of a current planning application for 45 dwellings)</li> <li>• West Harptree – Leacroft House site (SR2) should not be limited to 17 dwellings given sustainability of village and site location</li> <li>• West Harptree is a RA1 village and additional site should be allocated</li> <li>• East Harptree – Pinkers Farm (SR5) should not be allocated or some policy criteria are too onerous</li> <li>• East Harptree – land at Ashwood, Church Lane should be allocated as it is more suitable/deliverable &amp; less constrained than either site allocated in the Draft Plan and housing will help keep village facilities viable</li> <li>• Land at Hinton Blewett should be allocated for development (19 dwellings) to help address local need for affordable housing</li> <li>• Temple Cloud – two sites put forward for allocation to help meet strategic requirement and both also considered to be in sustainable locations and technical work shows suitable/deliverable</li> </ul>	
--	--	-----------------	---	--

## **APPENDIX 5: KEY ISSUES RAISED IN REPRESENTATIONS BY BATH SPA UNIVERSITY AND THE UNIVERSITY OF BATH**

1. Consultation responses from both Universities provide new information on their current footprint within the city and their future growth plans. Related to this, further research on HMO changes since the Article 4 Direction came into force reveals some emerging trend, of relevance to this issue and plan monitoring and review.

### Bath Spa

2. Bath Spa has undertaken an analysis of term time addresses to assess how many of its students actually take-up accommodation in the city during term time. The headline figure is that 57% of students take-up a bedspaces in a University Hall, Private Hall or HMO. To give that some context, 87% of all students are full-time, and 71% are full time undergraduates. Therefore, one cannot use these as reliable proxy for reality. Further, when forecasting the future it is reasonable to assume that only around 57% of new students will generate accommodation demand in the city in the aforementioned categories. A small number also rent privately outside of the HMO stock in Bath.
3. The University's growth plans for the future have matured since Placemaking Plan Options stage and have reduced. The current aspiration is to grow from around 7,100 in 2012/13 to around 10,700 in 2020/21. That is an increase of around 3,600. The previous forecast was for growth around 4,500, but the Bath Spa Global programme is now expected to generate far fewer new students by this time. This reduction in growth (in a component that would have been very much 'in need' of accommodation in city), combined with a new understanding of the student accommodation footprint, means that the shortfall in accommodation to 2020/21 (taking into account growth and considerable new supply to date) to enable the aspiration is now reduced to around 1,000, as opposed to around 2,500, as stated in the Draft Plan. Nevertheless, the plan period continues to 2029 and although institutions don't plan beyond 5 years, some further growth can be expected to be aspired to. As a reminder, during the preparation of Core Strategy there was no growth plan.
4. The shortfall could reduce to 750 if Bath Spa students were to claim a half share of free to market accommodation that has been built/permitted, but they are not keen for this to be budgeted for as the accommodation type comprises studios (expensive/isolated) as opposed to communal living (cheaper/less isolated). However, some students will inevitably occupy this space and thus it needs to be taken into account.
5. The University would like to secure the supply gap (of 750-1,000) within new dedicated accommodation, as this provides security of supply, rather than relying wholly on HMO growth (which is now subject to more planning control than previously). A wholly HMO led approach to deliver 1,000 more bedspaces would require around 250 more properties over the next 5 years. That is not deliverable at the current post Article 4 Direction rate of permissions (see subsequent paragraphs), and in combination with competition from the University of Bath and from other markets for those properties that are permitted to convert. Nevertheless, there will continue to be some more HMOs that are secured by Bath Spa students. National Planning Practice Guidance recognises the role of the HMO sector as performing part of the solution for student accommodation. However, Plan's must also take account of local circumstances.



6. Alternatively, the need (or most of it) for around 1,000 more bedrooms could be secured in dedicated accommodation (equivalent to 2 more Green Park House type developments or 3 more Lower Bristol Road type developments or 6 more James Street West type developments). There is scope for the redevelopment of aging on-campus accommodation at the south end of Newton Park, but due to the sensitivities the net gain would likely be minor.
7. Whilst there is some flexibility in the Plan (particularly outside the Bath Enterprise Area) to enable some of the gap in supply, there is no guarantee that it will be secured by Bath Spa students. Further flexibility in Bath or elsewhere would come at the expense of the supply of land for housing to meet conventional needs, and as set out in the Draft Placemaking Plan that would need to be compensated for, as 'planned for' land supply delivers around 13,000 dwellings. Once, again this analysis of demand and supply is only up to 2020/21 and any further aspiration could present additional risks to conventional housing land supply.
8. No change to the Draft Plan's policies relating to this matter is recommended, although some of the evidence base will need to be updated prior to submission. The examining Inspector may require flexibility in the Plan to enable Bath Spa to meet its growth aspiration to 2020/21 in full. This may result in the need to consider sites to provide compensatory provision of conventional housing as referred to in the Draft Plan.

#### University of Bath

9. The representations of the University of Bath show that the headline picture for the University of Bath in term of numbers has not really changed. From 2012/13 to 2020/21 the aspiration is to grow by 4,500 students from 14,455 to 19,000. As of 2015/16 it is at 16,300. As previously stated by the University the share of total numbers of students being in accommodation need will likely rise from about 73% to 78%. Once, again these numbers are only to 2020/21. Draft Placemaking Plan Policy B5 and the supporting text to it in relation to the University Bath's growth aspiration, the associated accommodation needs and supply remain valid.
10. Their representations extol the value of the institution in principle and to the city and seek to, as one would expect, achieve a favourable town planning framework. It wants more flexibility within the city to achieve its goals which would effectively mean that current objectives for housing and employment land may have to be met in a slightly different way e.g. using Green Belt land at Bath or Green Belt or non-Green Belt land further afield.
11. That desire to establish the room for manoeuvre is also reflected in their representations that seek to push back, in part, the new policy framework covering the campus itself – which is subject to a significant number of environmental issues.
12. The University has also prepared a revised masterplan responding to the Placemaking Plan. Further assessment needs to be undertaken of the capacity to accommodate growth on-campus, including the proportion of new floorspace that could be used for student accommodation and academic space. This is critical in considering the impact on the policy approach for the city and the University's request for greater flexibility in the policy framework. This will be an issue for discussion at the Examination.
13. It is recommended no change to the plan is made prior to submission and the issues outlined above are debated by all relevant stakeholders at the Examination. The examining

Inspector may seek to enable the University of Bath to meet its aspirations in full, with the flexibility within the city, which would have the same consequences as set out for Bath Spa.

#### Houses in Multiple Occupation

14. The number of HMOs permitted since July 2013 is set out below. Note that there will be a time lag between 2015/16 permissions and these properties coming to market, being occupied and any Council tax exemption being applied for. The share for 2015/16 occupied by students will increase as will the overall rolling share. It might reasonably be expected that both will be around 50-55% once the lag ends and this will continue to be monitored.

	Permitted HMO conversions	Council tax exempt	% Council tax exempt (student HMOs)
2013/14 (9 months)	18	8	44%
2014/15	37	20	54%
2015/16 (11 Months)	41	15	37%
<b>Total</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>45%</b>

15. This highlights that around half of HMOs permitted are not for students and this needs to be taken into account in reviewing the HMOs SPD. Further, the Draft Placemaking Plan currently requires compensatory provision for the growth in Council tax exempt HMOs that result from planning permissions and a reasonable, annual estimate for these currently would be 15-20 per annual, against an annualised housing target for Bath of 388.