

Bath & North East Somerset Council

MEETING:	Council
MEETING DATE:	15 th September 2011
TITLE:	Core Strategy – Post submission changes
WARD:	ALL

AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM

List of attachments to this report:

Annex A: Housing land supply and contingency

Annex B: Gypsy & Traveller site requirements

Annex C: Minerals Policy

Annex D: Changes to the Core Strategy arising from amendments to the Transport Strategy

Annex E: Other changes arising from the Inspector's Issues

Annex F: Potential changes arising from the National Planning Policy Framework

Annex G: Composite Schedule of changes to the Draft Core Strategy

THE ISSUE

- 1.1 The Core Strategy has reached a key stage in its preparation. It has been submitted for examination and public hearings are due to in January 2012. The Core Strategy is therefore now under examination. The Inspector has undertaken preliminary assessment of the Core Strategy and has raised a number of concerns which require a response from the Council. Some of these issues may require an amendment to the Core Strategy. If agreed, these amendments will need to undergo community engagement to ensure the Inspector has the full range of views to inform the examination process.

RECOMMENDATION

Council is asked:

- 2.1 to agree that:
 - a. changes are made to the Core Strategy as outlined in the composite schedule of changes attached as Annex G, including the identification of a Housing contingency location;
 - b. these changes are published for community engagement;

- c. public consultation is undertaken on the technical investigations into potential sites for the proposed upstream compensatory flood storage needed to facilitate the redevelopment of the Bath river corridor sites; and

2.2 to note the potential changes to the Core Strategy arising from the Government's Draft National Planning Policy Framework (set out in Annex F), agree that they should be subject to community engagement and sent to the Examination Inspector for consideration as part of the Core Strategy examination process.

3 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

3.1 The Core Strategy is being prepared within the Service Plan budget and in accordance with the Local Development Scheme. It is essential that the Core Strategy is progressed in order for the Council to develop and adopt a Community Infrastructure Levy. Otherwise, the Council will not be able to continue to secure funds from developers to pay for infrastructure for new development. In addition, a delay to the Core Strategy may inhibit growth and development in the District with a knock on impact on government award of New Homes Bonus to B&NES.

3.2 The infrastructure needed to support the delivery of development is set out in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Programme. This highlights the costs of development and funding arrangements. In particular, the Council will need to take a lead, working with the Environment Agency, on the provision a compensatory flood storage facility. Initial estimates put the capital cost at between £3 – 5 million. A provision was included in the West of England Development Infrastructure & Investment Plan (DIIP) for the facility and a bid is being prepared to the Homes & Communities Agency for the necessary funding.

4 CORPORATE PRIORITIES

- *Building communities where people feel safe and secure*
- *Improving life chances of disadvantaged teenagers and young people*
- *Improving school buildings*
- *Sustainable growth*
- *Improving the availability of Affordable Housing*
- *Addressing the causes and effects of Climate Change*
- *Improving transport and the public realm*

5 THE REPORT

5.1 In his preliminary assessment the Inspector has raised a number of concerns requiring a response from the Council. Four of these concerns may warrant changes to the Core Strategy and these are listed below and addressed in more detail in annexes A to D to this report. These issues are;

- A. Housing supply & delivery;
- B. The need to quantify the Gypsy & Traveller site requirement in the Core Strategy (accepting that the site identification process will take place in a separate plan);
- C. The Council's policy on minerals;
- D. The risk that changes to the Bath Package might have on the Core Strategy.

- 5.2 The **housing supply & delivery** is perhaps the most significant issue and this is considered in detail in Annex A.
- 5.3 In addition to the issues listed above, the Inspector raises a number of other issues, some of which may require more limited changes to the Core Strategy and these are addressed in annex E attached. The changes to the Core Strategy emerging from all of the issues discussed in annexes A to E are set out in the composite schedule attached as annex G.
- 5.4 The Government is also in the process of changing national planning policy, primarily through the new **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**. The Inspector has asked the Council to consider the implications for the Core Strategy of the draft NPPF. This issue is addressed in Annex F.
- 5.5 At this stage in the process, any changes to the Core Strategy should be limited to those which are essential in order to respond to potential soundness issues as raised by the Inspector. Any changes to the Core Strategy will need to undergo **community engagement** in order for the Inspector to have the full range of views when examining these issues. The community engagement will also include the schedule of changes agreed through delegated arrangements following the consideration earlier this year of public comments on the draft Core Strategy.
- 5.6 Any changes to the Core Strategy agreed at this stage also need to be subject to **Sustainability Appraisal (SA)** to assess their sustainability affects. The schedule of changes attached as annex G to this report has undergone SA. The results of the SA are a background paper to the Council report.
- 5.7 In addition to the above changes the Inspector has asked for more detail on the delivery of **flood risk** management solutions in relation to the development of sites along the river corridor in Bath. The agreed Flood Risk Management Strategy (FRMS) for Bath entails a combination of on-site flood defences combined with up-stream flood storage. In consultation with the Environment Agency, the Council has commissioned a technical study to assess the site options for providing upstream compensatory storage and the storage capacity required. It is proposed to consult on the findings of this study with a view to the Council adopting a preferred solution and delivery programme prior to the Core Strategy EIP.

6 RISK MANAGEMENT

- 6.1 A risk assessment related to the issue and recommendations has been undertaken, in compliance with the Council's decision making risk management guidance.
- 6.2 The risks of not identifying a contingency are;
- increased possibility of the Core Strategy being found unsound,
 - inability to progress the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which is dependent on adoption of the Core Strategy. CIL must be in place by March 2014 when the ability to seek developer contributions is significantly scaled back. In addition changes to Local Government funding mean that the Council is increasingly dependent on local sources of funding e.g. the New Homes Bonus, CIL, rates and a failure in housing delivery will have an impact on resources
 - a loss of control over the location of new housing, particularly in light of the Government's new presumption in favour of development.

- the increased risk that housing needs will not be met exacerbating affordable housing needs and potentially limiting economic growth

7 EQUALITIES

- 7.1 Equalities Impact Assessments (EQIA) have been an integral part of the preparation of the Core Strategy and in accordance with Council policy the changes set out in annex G have also been subject to Equalities Impact Assessment. This assessment is a background paper to the report.
- 7.2 In summary, the EQIA has identified several positive impacts of the Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy. Two potential adverse impacts were highlighted and mitigation of these is identified in the Action Plan. The potential for adverse impact on rural communities is mitigated through an action to ensure impact on the rural landscape is considered through masterplanning of any development of the contingency location. The potential for adverse impact on the age, disability and gender strands relating to appropriate parking provision within Bath is mitigated through an action to ensure this is considered through the Parking Strategy.

8 CONSULTATION

- 8.1 *Ward Councillor; Cabinet Member; Parish Council; Town Council; Trades Unions; Overview & Scrutiny Panel; Staff; Other B&NES Services; Service Users; Local Residents; Community Interest Groups; Youth Council; Stakeholders/Partners; Other Public Sector Bodies; Charter Trustees of Bath; Section 151 Finance Officer; Chief Executive; Monitoring Officer*
- 8.2 Changes will be subject to community engagement.

9 ISSUES TO CONSIDER IN REACHING THE DECISION

9. *Social Inclusion; Customer Focus; Sustainability; Human Resources; Property; Young People; Human Rights; Corporate; Health & Safety; Impact on Staff; Other Legal Considerations*

10 ADVICE SOUGHT

- 10.1 The Council's Monitoring Officer (Divisional Director – Legal and Democratic Services) and Section 151 Officer (Divisional Director - Finance) have had the opportunity to input to this report and have cleared it for publication.

Contact person	<i>David Trigwell, Divisional Director - Planning and Transport 01225 394125 Simon de Beer Policy & Environment Manager 01225 477616</i>
Background papers	<i>Inspector's letters to B*&NES Ref ID/1, ID/4 B&NES Submission Core Strategy West of England Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Assessment</i>

(GTAA), 2007

[B&NES Surface Mining Resource Areas](#), Coal Authority (2009)

Draft National Planning Policy Framework

Strategic Housing Land Availability Study

Sustainability Appraisal of the proposed changes to the Core Strategy

Equalities Impact Assessment of changes to the Core Strategy

B&NES Core Strategy Infrastructure Delivery Programme

West of England Development Infrastructure Investment Programme

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment July 2011

B&NES Future Housing Growth Requirements to 2026: Stage 2 Report

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

ANNEX A: HOUSING LAND

THE ISSUES

- A1.1 The Inspector will consider at the Examination whether the Core Strategy is planning for the right level of housing needs and economic growth and whether the Council's strategy is sufficiently robust and flexible to accommodate the proposed level of growth. The Inspector is concerned that the Core Strategy;
- is providing for a much lower level of housing that was required by the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS),
 - is able to respond to greater than anticipated economic growth, migration and housing pressures in light of the importance the Government is now placing on promoting economic growth,
 - should plan for a greater level of overall housing to enable more affordable housing in light of the significant need in B&NES,
 - is sufficiently flexible to accommodate even the planned scale of growth if the major brownfield sites are delivered more slowly or have less housing capacity than planned,
 - does not plan for the backlog of unmet housing from previous years

- A1.2 In order to respond to the Inspector, three options are set out below.

OPTION 1 – NO HOUSING CONTINGENCY

- A1.3 The Core Strategy plans for a growth in around 11,000 houses and 8,700 jobs by 2026. This compares with up-to-date evidence commissioned by B&NES that around 11,600 dwellings and 8,700 jobs will be needed. It is acknowledged that this is a tight housing land supply and that there is limited flexibility/contingency. This is a result of the particular circumstances in B&NES and the outcome of consideration of alternatives. In particular it is important to note that;

- the housing supply as identified in SHLAA is around 11,200 dwellings (without Green Belt changes , prioritising brownfield sites and focussing new development on in the most sustainable locations)
- the district's extremely high quality environment (eg Bath is the UK's only city which is entirely a WHS, extensive AONB within the District, high concentration of listed buildings, numerous conservation areas, home to bats of European importance)
- a strong view from local communities that they do not want to see strategic changes to the Green Belt
- new development should be aligned with the provision of necessary infrastructure and infrastructure may be a limiting factor on growth levels
- the spatial strategy should be co-ordinated with that of adjoining authorities

- A1.4 However, the Council may wish not to make any changes and continue to defend this strategy at examination. In addition to the above points, the Council's case would focus on the following points;

- The strategy entails a significant uplift in past rates of housing delivery from around 380 to 550 per annum.
- The strategy enables delivery of the substantial Council's economic growth reflecting national objectives
- The Council has a new focus on delivery and is address past problems of non-delivery
- There is some scope, albeit limited, for contingency within the existing strategy through flexibility on densities and mix of uses and in the assessment of housing need in the Stage 2 Report.

Risks of Option 1

- A1.5 The risks of not identifying a contingency are significant;
- Increased likelihood of an unsound Core Strategy
 - inability to progress the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which is dependent on adoption of the Core Strategy. CIL must be in place by March 2014 when the ability to seek developer contributions is significantly scaled back
 - A delay in the Core Strategy means that the Governments new presumption in favour of development will result in loss of control over the location of new housing.
 - Changes to Local Government funding mean that the Council is increasingly dependent on local sources of funding eg the New Homes Bonus, CIL, rates and a failure in housing delivery will have a significant impact on resources
 - There is the risk that housing needs will not be met, thereby exacerbating affordable housing needs and potentially limiting economic growth

OPTION 2 - WITHDRAW THE CORE STRATEGY

- A1.6 This option would be relevant if the Council decided that it wanted to re-assess the locational strategy afresh and identify locations not included in the 2009 Spatial Options Document. The Council cannot withdraw a submitted plan but it can request that the Secretary of State direct that the Core Strategy is withdrawn. This option is therefore only relevant if the Council is prepared to contemplate strategic changes to the Green Belt

Risks of Option 2

- A1.7 The risks are similar to option 1 because of the delay in getting an up-to-date plan in place.

OPTION 3 - IDENTIFYING A HOUSING CONTINGENCY

Need for a contingency in B&NES

- A1.8 It is acknowledged that some of the points made by the Inspector in para 2.1 above are valid and there is limited scope to react if development does not progress as planned. In particular, it is recognised that;
- housing supply is tight : the Core Strategy plans for 11,000 dwellings to 2026 and although the Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) identifies 11,200 dwellings, the likely requirement is just over 11,000 dwellings.
 - The District does not have a good track record on housing delivery. For instance there was a shortfall of around a 1000 dwellings during the Local Plan period for which the District is not seeking to address. Whilst the Council is improving its delivery mechanisms, a significant proportion of the housing supply is on brownfield sites which are recognised as being difficult to bring forward.

- A1.9 In light of the tight housing land supply and the potential for sites not to come forward as planned, there is considerable merit in identifying a contingency. It is suggested that this could be up to 10% ie 1000 dwellings. The Core Strategy would need to identify a feasible location with sufficient capacity.

The trigger for contingency

- A1.10 The precise arrangements for triggering a contingency will need to be agreed by Council and submitted for examination. It is recommended that a contingency will only be required if monitoring of housing development during the first 5 years of the plan period revealed that the Council's planned housing delivery is not being achieved or if growth rates are significantly greater than those being planned for in the Core Strategy and that this is having major implications for meeting housing needs or constraining economic growth. A

decision from Council would then be needed to agree the precise extent and location of the development. The change needed now to the Core Strategy would be to amend Policy DW1 and the Key Diagram (Diagram 4) with wording similar to that in the adopted Bristol Core Strategy as follows:

Preamble to Overall Strategy Policy DW1

Amend para 1.36 as follows;

“1.36 Contingency: The Core strategy recognises the need to be responsive in light of future uncertainty and unforeseen circumstances. There is the scope for flexibility in the mix of uses and density of some of the large redevelopment sites such as at Somerdale in Keynsham and the MoD sites in Bath. In addition, there is scope in Bath’s western corridor to vary the mix of uses to respond to needs for development. This flexibility maintains the overall strategy of a priority on urban focussed brownfield opportunities. The Council will monitor delivery rates in the plan period which will shape the early review of the Core Strategy which is programmed for around 2016. **The Core Strategy is based on the regeneration of brownfield land and the Council is not planning for the release of land from the Green Belt to meet development needs. However, if after the first 5 years following adoption, monitoring demonstrates that the planned housing provision has not been delivered at the levels expected, and flexibility on existing sites is insufficient to address this, then the use of some Green Belt land at Hicks Gate as a long-term contingency for the development of new homes will be considered. This will require close liaison with Bristol City Council**”

Add to Policy DW1

Contingency

If monitoring shows that planned housing provision will not be delivered at the levels expected the use of some Green Belt land at Hicks Gate as a long-term contingency for the development of new homes will be considered.

The broad location is indicated on the Key Diagram.

Preamble to Green Belt Policy CP8

Amend Para 6.63 as follows

“6.63 Core Policy CP8 conforms to national policy which also states that the general extent and detailed boundaries of the Green Belt should be altered only exceptionally. The Core Strategy does not envisage that the general extent of the Green Belt in B&NES should be altered in the plan period. This reflects the very high value attached by the communities in bath & North east Somerset to the openness of the Green Belt. **However Policy DW1 acknowledges that should the need be clearly demonstrated at the review of the Core Strategy in around 2016, land is identified as a housing contingency at Hicks gate on the edge of Bristol.**

Monitoring & Review

Add new para 7.07

“The need for the contingency development area at Hicks Gate will not be considered before 5 years following adoption. If, after 5 years following adoption, the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, to the extent that there is a substantial shortfall, in the order of around 1000 or more units, it accepts that the need for the contingency development area will be triggered, unless additional brownfield housing land supply can be identified as being available and developable beyond the next 5 years”.

A1.11 The spatial strategy does not therefore entail the release of land from the Green Belt. However, the need for development may warrant a review of the Core Strategy.

Risks of Option 3

A1.12 It is anticipated that identification of a contingency will address the Inspector's concerns although this will only be clarified through the examination process. If the contingency is ever triggered, then the harm to the environment will be realised.

Identifying a greenfield contingency location

A1.13 If it is accepted that greenfield contingency is required, then the appropriate location(s) will need to be considered. It is recommended that only the locations previously arrived at through the development of the Core Strategy should be revisited. These locations underwent technical analysis, public consultation and sustainability appraisal. If there is a desire by the Council to re-assess locations not in the 2009 options document then the Core Strategy will need to be withdrawn, reverting to an earlier stage in the process in order to avoid vulnerability to a legal challenge on procedural grounds.

A1.14 The potential locations for a contingency based on previously identified as urban extension options are described in more detail in the following section. The locations are;

- **Bath: West of Twerton**
- **Bath: Odd Down/South Stoke Plateau**
- **SE Bristol: Whitchurch**
- **SE Bristol: Hicks Gate**

A1.15 Whilst the Hicks Gate area was assessed along with the locations above, it was not put forward as an urban extension option partly because there was insufficient capacity to accommodate the identified development need, the impact on the Green Belt gap and lack of support from Bristol. However since then, land in this location has been identified as a contingency for Bristol in their adopted Core Strategy. Therefore, because it was investigated and consulted upon alongside the other sites, it should also be considered now as a contingency area.

Options excluded

A1.16 Although the locations above were assessed as urban extension locations and not a contingency location, the development issues are similar for both. Other locations not pursued are described in the Table 1 below.

Table 1: Locations for growth previously discounted


LOCATION	COMMENTS
Keynsham	<p>The locational strategy agreed across the West of England is to avoid significant development at the less sustainable market towns and instead focus new development & economic growth on the urban areas.</p> <p>Keynsham already has a significant growth planned during the Plan period at the SW Keynsham site (an urban extension of over 500 dwellings) and at Somerdale (potentially 600 dwellings plus employment growth)</p> <p>Keynsham is arguably in one of the most vulnerable parts of the Bristol Bath Green Belt lying in the A4 corridor in the strategic gap between Bath & Bristol. An expansion of the town to the east, west or north would impinge on this vulnerability.</p> <p>The Keynsham Town Plan seeks to maintain the town's separate identity</p>

South of the District beyond the Green Belt (ie Midsomer Norton, Radstock & Westfield area)	This location was rejected as a significant housing location at an early stage in the Core Strategy process as part of the First Detailed Proposals. There are already significant outstanding housing commitments (2,500 dwellings) and the areas have a vulnerable local economy with decreasing employment opportunities and very high levels of outcommuting. Opportunities for job creation and major infrastructure investment are limited; especially transport and adding more housing to this area would be very unsustainable
Rural areas	Two thirds of the district is Green Belt wherein there is very limited scope to expand villages The Core Strategy currently enables a level of development to rural areas to meet local needs and allows a fair degree of flexibility to meet local aspirations in light of the new localism agenda. However a dispersed approach of spreading a significant level of development across the rural areas is contrary to national policy (to which the Core Strategy must still conform) , is significantly out of step with west of England colleagues and is highly unsustainable leading to increased commuting, and an unsustainable pattern of development
Other locations around Bath	Land east & north of Bath fall within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and were eliminated at an early stage. It was concluded that other locations South West of Bath are technically unsuitable due to topography.
Stockwood vale	Technically unsuitable due to topography and damage to the landscape

Assessment of the 4 options


A1.17 An assessment of the four locations has been undertaken and the results are set out below. Assessment of the four locations has taken into account that the scale of development is less than that in the Spatial Options document. Whilst the outcome of this assessment should not be prejudged, set out below is a brief analysis of some of the key points in relation to the potential for each location to be identified as a greenfield contingency:

Contingency Option 1: West of Twerton (more than 1000 dwellings)




Issue	Description
Historic Environment	<p>Negative Impact on the setting of the World Heritage Site</p> <p>Assessments undertaken using the Council's <i>World Heritage Site Setting Study</i> has established the high impact of development in this location on the World Heritage site in terms of its landscape, visual and historic setting. Development would be prominent on the skyline and from key views within and on the approach into Bath, the location also forms an important part of the green hillside setting of the World Heritage site. Development would extend beyond the defined edge of the city creating a physically separated settlement. There are no real opportunities to mitigate these impacts.</p> <p>English Heritage now strongly objects to development in this location on the basis of this evidence and this objection is backed by national policy. In light of this it would be highly challenging to present as a feasible contingency.</p>
Landscape	<p>Negative Impact on the setting of Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</p> <p>Development in this location would have high adverse impact on the landscape, while it is outside the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, there would be significant impact on the setting of this nationally designated landscape. It would be extremely difficult to bring forward effective measures to mitigate these impacts.</p> <p>This issue has been raised as an objection to development in this location by Natural England and is backed by national policy and case law.</p>
Green Belt	<p>The green belt here plays a significant role in the separation of Bristol and Bath and is valuable in checking urban sprawl, preserving the setting/special character of Bath and in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</p>

Contingency Option 2: Odd Down/South Stoke Plateau (around 750 dwellings)



Issue	Description
Landscape & Visual Impact	While the reduced capacity option would still have significant landscape impact, high negative impacts on the landscape can be avoided in a reduced capacity option. There are opportunities to effectively mitigate the landscape impacts of this lower level of development.
Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	The reduced contingency option is located entirely within with AONB, exceptional circumstances and a lack of suitable alternatives outside the AONB would need to be demonstrated to identify this area as a contingency to avoid direct conflict with national policy.
Historic Environment	Development in this location would impact on the Wansdyke Scheduled Ancient Monument and the setting of South Stoke Village Conservation area . These impacts could in part be mitigated by drawing development back from the plateau edge and vegetation screening to South Stoke lane. A 30 metre buffer around the Wansdyke could also be introduced. However, it is not possible to fully mitigate these impacts to historic assets.
World Heritage Site setting	High negative impacts on the World Heritage Site setting can largely be avoided in the lower development capacity option - by avoiding development of the land either side of the A367, by drawing development back from the South Stoke plateau edge to the south and by enhancing tree cover. There would still be a medium impact of developing in this location particularly the historic setting of the WHS as this breaches the containment of the city boundary provided by the Wansdyke.
Ecology	This area is located within the main feeding area and flight corridor for horseshoe bats (European protected species) associated with the Bath & Bradford-upon-Avon Special Area of Conservation . To comply with EU Habitat Regulations it must be demonstrated that development must cause no adverse effects upon the integrity on protected species or the SAC. While it is considered there would be potential to mitigate these impacts by a number of design and management methods, the details of these mitigation arrangements would need to be demonstrated at the stage of identifying this site as a contingency. A detailed mitigation strategy is not currently in place.
Slope, Geological Instability & Undermining	The Councils <i>Slope, Geological Instability & Undermining Study (2010)</i> these issues in the Odd Down/South Stoke Plateau area - however they can be overcome by engineering solutions at cost. This lower capacity option could avoid areas with these issues.
Transport	A transport modelling assessment has been carried out for this reduced capacity option; there is no significant reduction in impact from a higher level of development. The area has good public transport accessibility.


Contingency Option 3: Whitchurch (around 800 dwellings)



Issue	Description
Transport	<p>Existing transport capacity problems in this location is a major constraint to development. The developer has argued that up to 800 dwellings could be developed without the need for significant transport infrastructure being provided. However, an assessment of this transport modelling work has challenged its findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - While the developer has modelled walking catchments to existing bus stops, the current service to Whitchurch village is limited - Signal junctions in Whitchurch village are heavily congested particularly accessing onto the A37 and would be worsened by development, and additional traffic would be attracted to inappropriate side roads worsening existing highway network problems.
Relationship to Bristol	<p>Bristol has identified South Bristol as a major area for regeneration in their Core Strategy, greenfield development in the immediate vicinity could serve to threaten these regeneration aspirations. However, Bristol has indicated that it will not support a corollary in B&NES.</p>

<p>Environmental Impact</p>	<p>The environmental impact on the Maes Knoll Scheduled Ancient Monument, Mediaeval field patterns, protected habitats & species and the impact on the Chew Valley skyline could be considerably mitigated and avoided if development is limited to 800 dwellings.</p> <p>However, the loss of the open rural setting of Whitchurch village and the setting of Grade II* Listed Lyons Court Farm would be not be possible to fully mitigate.</p>
<p>Housing need</p>	<p>The main focus for housing need in the district is at Bath, although development in this location will be contributing to a B&NES housing target it is not located in the main area of need. At a lower development capacity there is less opportunity to provide employment at this location; this is likely to support economic growth within Bristol rather than B&NES.</p>

Contingency Option 4: Hicks Gate (up to 700 dwellings)



Issue	Description
Relationship to Bristol	<p>At the Core Strategy Options stage Hicks Gate was not included as a potential urban extension location primarily as it did not have the capacity to accommodate anywhere near the required 3,650 dwellings. Furthermore, at this time development of the land at Hicks Gate on the Bristol City Council side of the boundary was not being considered. It was investigated and consulted on which enables the site to be considered as a contingency at this stage.</p> <p>Bristol's Core Strategy identifies land at Hicks Gate as a long term development contingency for up to 800 homes, should they fail to deliver across other sites in Bristol this location would be revisited. However Bristol has indicated that it will not support a corollary in B&NES.</p> <p>It should be noted that B&NES Council expressed "extreme concern" in relation to this Hicks Gate contingency because of its impact on the separation of Bristol and Keynsham at the examination stage and noted that the area has significant constraints and performed poorly in Bristol's sustainability appraisal.</p>
Urban Design Issues	<p>There are challenges to developing a high quality development in this location. The A4 splits the site and acts as a strong physical barrier and air quality and noise issues are also a concern. The immediate area that this area would be an extension to consists of bulky retail, light industrial warehousing and distribution, this is not entirely compatible with residential development and the residential community here would be relatively isolated.</p>
Green Belt	<p>The Hicks Gate area has a critical role in the Bristol-Bath Green Belt maintaining the separation of the Keynsham and Bristol. Development at this location would significantly impact on this green belt gap. However, by keeping development back from the ridge-line the highest landscape impact can be significantly avoided. This could also maintain the principle of the green belt gap.</p>
Transport	<p>This area has the potential to be well served by public transport and does not appear to have the transport capacity issues presented at Whitchurch. There may be a need for access points from the Bristol City Council side of the boundary.</p>
Housing need	<p>The main focus for housing need in the district is at Bath, development in this location although it will be contributing to a B&NES housing target is not located in the main area of need. Due to the limited development capacity in this area there is less opportunity to provide employment at this location although the location is more desirable as an employment location than Whitchurch</p>

Conclusion

A1.18 That the existing strategy of brownfield regeneration is maintained but allow for a housing contingency location at Hicks Gate only if the need is clearly demonstrated. This will not be before at least 5 years after the adoption of the Core Strategy and only if specific criteria are met. The changes are set out in para A1.10 above and in Annex G.

Annex B: Gypsy & Traveller site requirements

The Issues

A2.1 The Draft Core Strategy makes a reference to the needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople and includes a criterion based policy for dealing with applications. Whilst the Inspector is content that site allocations can be dealt with through a separate Gypsies and Travellers Site Allocations Development Plan Document (G&T DPD), he points out that the Core Strategy should set out the strategic approach for the G&T DPD by indicating:

- the scale of accommodation needs
- the broad approach to be taken to accommodating these needs and
- how needs beyond 2011 will be assessed

A2.2 The lack of either permanent residential or transit sites in the District has led to a number of unauthorised sites and private sites without planning permission and continues to raise a number of enforcement issues which are costly to the Council.

Legal requirements

A2.3 It is a requirement under the 2004 Housing Act (Section 225) for the Council to carry out a Gypsy & Traveller accommodation needs assessment and to take a strategic approach in order to address a lack of suitable accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers. The Council therefore has a statutory obligation to make suitable site provision. The Council also has a statutory general duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to 'pay due regard' to the need to eliminate unlawful racial discrimination, to promote equality of opportunity and to promote good race relations between different racial groups.

Scale of need

A2.4 The [West of England Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Assessment](#) (GTAA), undertaken in 2007, identifies the scale of need for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople for the period to 2011 and is summarised in Table 2 below. The GTAA also provides an indication of forecast need up to 2016 based on an allowance for the growth of families recognising that whilst it is possible to identify current need, accurate projections of future needs are likely to be more difficult. The GTAA and its findings are publicly available as part of the Council's Local Development Framework evidence base and is already referred to in the draft Core Strategy.

Table 2: GTAA identified needs in B&NES

Type of requirement:	2006 - 2011	Growth 2011 - 2016	Total 2006 - 2016
Permanent pitches for Gypsies & Travellers	19	3	22
Transit pitches for Gypsies & Travellers	20	0	20
Plots for Travelling Showpeople	1	0	1

Note:

- Provision of permanent authorised sites will help integration and inclusion with the settled communities
- Transit provision facilitates movement amongst Gypsy and Traveller communities, addresses the need for short-term stopping places and can minimise disruption that unauthorised encampments can cause

A2.5 Whilst the draft Core Strategy makes reference to the GTAA it does not specify the scale of identified needs. By changing the text of the Core Strategy to refer to the scale of needs to

be met through the G&T DPD as evidenced in the GTAA (and summarised in Table 2), the Council will be confirming that it will meet the established accommodation needs by identifying sufficient suitable and deliverable sites. This is a contentious issue as Members will need to discuss and agree the position in respect of the following questions, whether:

- the G&T DPD should address permanent pitches only or also include transit pitches
- the needs of Travelling Showpeople are also addressed in the G&T DPD
- the G&T DPD should make site provision to meet the need up to 2011 and also the indicative need to 2016

Approach to accommodating needs

A2.6 The draft Core Strategy currently confirms that the Local Development Framework must consider the accommodation needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople and it sets out criteria in Policy CP11 against which applications for such accommodation will be determined. In order to address the Inspector's concern a change to the text would be needed to confirm that the needs will be met through identification and allocation of sites in the G&T DPD (in conjunction with the change outlined above to specify which identified needs will be addressed in the DPD). Policy CP11 would also need to be amended to make it clear that identification of the sites through the DPD will use the same criteria already outlined in the policy. This represents a relatively minor change to the wording of the policy.

Assessing needs beyond 2011

A2.7 Assessing the needs beyond 2011 will be achieved through a process of reviewing and updating the GTAA. No reference is currently made to this in the Core Strategy but this could be included in the Core Strategy text.

Options for addressing the Issues

Option 1

A2.8 Make no amendments to the text of the Gypsies, Travellers & Travelling Showpeople section. In not addressing the issues raised by the Inspector and not setting out the scale of need in the Core Strategy and how this need will be met through the planning process the Council:

- will be in breach of its statutory obligations in meeting identified accommodation needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople
- will not be able to demonstrate its commitment to meeting existing and future needs when assessed
- without identifying sites, will continue to be vulnerable to losing planning appeals with the potential risk of sites being allowed in unsuitable locations

Option 2

A2.9 In the light of issues raised above, make changes to the Core Strategy, which will address the Inspector's concerns, as follows:

- Acknowledge the local shortage of authorised sites for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople and clarify the scale of accommodation needs to be met (as identified by the West of England GTAA)
- Confirmation that this scale of need will be met through the G&T DPD
- Confirmation that the future accommodation needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople (beyond 2011) will be met once assessed

- Change policy GT.11 to make it clear that the criteria already outlined for assessing applications will be used in the process of identifying and allocating sites in the separate DPD

Conclusion

Amend the section on Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (pages 124-125 of the draft Core Strategy) as set out above. The wording of these changes is set out in the schedule in annex G.

Annex C: Minerals Policy

The Issues

- A3.1 Whilst the Draft Core Strategy has a dedicated section on minerals (paragraphs 6.65 - 6.69), there is no accompanying policy setting out the overall approach to minerals at a strategic level because this issue is already addressed in the Local Plan. However, the Inspector points out that the Core Strategy would normally be the place for the overall policy approach to minerals to be set out with any detailed policies and designations to be included as part of the Placemaking Plan or equivalent.
- A3.2 The Inspector also makes reference to the representation from the Coal Authority (as a statutory consultee) in relation to mineral safeguarding, land stability and other matters from the coalfield legacy. The Inspector advises that the Core Strategy should refer to the need to define Mineral Safeguarding Areas in relation to coal and other minerals within the district to accord with national minerals planning policy. The Core Strategy should also make mention of the coalfield legacy and land stability. The Inspector has asked that any additional text is agreed with the Coal Authority.
- A3.3 There is now an obligation on all Mineral Planning Authorities to define Minerals Safeguarding Areas. The Minerals Consultation Areas as shown on the existing Proposals Map reflect an outdated approach and now only relevant in the case of a two tier authority and should be based on the Mineral Safeguarding Areas.

Options for addressing the Issues

Option 1

- A3.4 Make no amendments to the text of the Minerals section. However by maintaining the current approach in the Core Strategy and not addressing the issues identified by the Inspector effective implementation of national minerals planning policy will not be achieved. This can be remedied by making a number of textual changes to the Core Strategy for the purposes of clarification as set out below.

Option 2

- A3.5 Changes could be made to the minerals section to address the Inspector's concerns which would:
- clarify that the Mineral Safeguarding Areas (already referred to in the text of the Core Strategy) will relate to coal as well as other minerals
 - highlight in the text the need to take into account the coalfield legacy and land stability and indicate the general extent of the surface mining coal resource areas within the District in a diagram
 - include a broad strategic minerals policy
- A3.6 The changes would also clarify the strategic policy framework for minerals and provide the context for review of the more detailed Local Plan Policies on minerals to address the requirements of Minerals Policy Statement 1: 'Planning and Minerals' and Minerals Planning Guidance 3: 'Coal mining and colliery spoil disposal', and to ensure mineral resources are not needlessly sterilised by non-mineral development.

Conclusion

Amend the section on Minerals (page 121) of the draft Core Strategy). The wording of these changes is set out in the schedule in annex G and reflected comments following informal consultation with the Coal Authority.

Annex D: Changes to Core Strategy arising from changes to the Bath Transport Strategy

The Issue

- A4.1 Since the preparation and publication of the draft Core Strategy the Council has made a number of changes to the Bath Transportation Package (BTP). These changes resulted in the elements listed below no longer forming part of the best and final bid for the BTP submitted to the Department for Transport:
- The Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Segregated Route
 - The A36 Lower Bristol Road Bus Lane
 - The A4 London Road Lambridge Bus Lane
 - New A4 Eastern P&R (1,400 spaces), plus bus lane priority on the A4/A46 slip road
 - Restrict the expansion of the 500 space Newbridge P&R site to 750 rather than 1000 spaces.
- A4.2 The Inspector has raised concern as to whether and how the changes to the BTP affect the spatial strategy for Bath.
- A4.3 Whilst the changes to the BTP have implications for the transport strategy for Bath the Council is still able to demonstrate that it has a coherent strategy for addressing the transport problems in the city that will also enable the growth directed to the city by the Core Strategy to be delivered in a way that minimises travel related environmental harm.
- A4.4 The effect of the loss of a significant proportion of the additional park & ride spaces will be ameliorated by further improvements to public transport, In particular, the recently announced electrification of the Swindon-Bath-Bristol main rail line will provide the opportunity for substantial additional passenger capacity. This will help to compensate for the delay in establishing an east of Bath Park & Ride site, options for which are being reviewed.
- A4.5 The Council remains committed to the strategy of reducing the availability of long stay parking within the city centre. However, in the short term current parking capacity will have to be retained.
- A4.6 The implications for the transport strategy for Bath of changes to the BTP as outlined above will need to be reflected in changes to the Core Strategy. As such changes to the Core Strategy will:
- Confirm the Council's broad transport strategy for the city
 - Outline the measures that will be delivered to achieve this strategy, including reference to the BTP; other public transport improvements (including electrification of the main rail line) and improvements to cycling and walking infrastructure (including Local Sustainable Transport Fund)
 - Refer to the need to maintain existing central area parking levels in the short term
 - Factual amendments to the measures included in the BTP

Conclusion

Amend the transport section of the Bath chapter (pages 56 & 57 of the draft Core Strategy) as outlined above. The wording of these changes is set out in the schedule in annex G.

Annex E: Other Changes to the Core Strategy arising from the inspector's issues

The Issues

A5.1 The Inspector has raised various other concerns in his preliminary assessment of the Core Strategy. Most of these issues do not necessitate consideration of a change to the Core Strategy. Those issues that do are as follows:

- Rural areas – clarity in policies relating to different types of villages
- Design policy – requirement to meet Building for Life standard
- Clarification of retrofitting policy
- Sustainable Construction and District Heating policies – concern that the requirements of the policy should not make development unviable
- Affordable Housing policy and references to the viability of development (see also Affordable Rented Tenure issue in annex F below)
- Monitoring – effectiveness of the monitoring framework

Rural Areas

A5.2 The Inspector has raised concerns regarding the operation of policy RA1. In particular the Inspector is unclear as to whether the indicative list of villages meeting the criteria of policy RA1 set out in the Core Strategy is fixed now or whether the policy criteria are to be applied at the time of an application. He also considers reference to the list of villages being included in the review of the Core Strategy to be confusing. Furthermore the Inspector considers the Core Strategy is unclear as to whether demonstrating local support for development through the views of the relevant parish council applies only now or whether it applies throughout the plan period.

A5.3 The policy framework for the rural areas is not proposed to be changed and inclusion of an indicative list of villages currently meeting the criteria of policy RA1 is also proposed to be retained in the Core Strategy. However, some minor changes to the text accompanying policy RA1 is proposed in the schedule attached as Annex G in order to clarify the operation of the policy. These changes will make it clear that the indicative list reflects the current position and could be subject to change during the lifetime of the plan and that assessing whether there is local community support for development throughout the plan period will be demonstrated via the views of the parish council or an alternative mechanism should one be introduced through the localism bill.

Design

A5.4 Policy CP6 Environmental quality in the draft Core Strategy requires that all major housing schemes meet CABE's Building for Life (BfL) good standard as a minimum. The Inspector has asked the Council to reconsider the appropriateness of embedding within a development plan policy a requirement to meet a specific standard for BfL, bearing in mind the formal process required to assess buildings under that scheme and the fact that the reduced activities of CABE may affect the BfL accreditation process.

A5.5 Given that the Inspector proposed a similar change to the Bristol Core Strategy it is prudent to consider a change to the B&NES Core Strategy policy. The objective of the policy could still be achieved by changing it to require that schemes are assessed using the BfL methodology or an equivalent methodology if the BfL scheme is discontinued and that as a guide schemes should meet the good standard.

Climate Change Policies

A5.6 The Inspector is unclear whether policy CP1 which encourages retrofitting of energy efficiency measures only applies to existing buildings within the applicant's site or whether the Council intends to seek retrofitting for existing buildings unconnected with the site. The latter would be difficult to justify and the policy was only ever intended to apply to buildings

within the applicant's site. A minor change to the wording of the policy is suggested in the schedule in annex G to clarify this.

- A5.7 In relation to both policies CP2 (sustainable construction) and CP4 (district heating) the Inspector has raised a concern about the impact of the requirements on the viability of development. The Inspector states that a change to both policies to make it clear that their requirements should not apply if it can be demonstrated that it would not be viable is likely to be necessary for the soundness of the Core Strategy. As such the Council does not appear to have much choice but to propose changes to both policies. The wording of the relevant changes is set out in the schedule of changes (see Annex G).

Affordable Housing

- A5.8 The draft Core Strategy policy on affordable housing (CP9) sets out the average proportion of affordable housing that will be sought on large sites (i.e. 35%) and sets out the circumstances under which a higher or lower proportion may be sought. The Inspector makes it clear that development viability needs to be more fully embedded in the policy and not viewed as an exceptional circumstance if the policy is to be sound in this regard. A policy wording change is set out in the schedule attached as Annex G.

Monitoring Framework

- A5.9 The Inspector has raised concern that some of the monitoring indicators in the framework set out in chapter 7 do not have a 'Quantification of objective' (or target in conventional terms) and as a result there is no means of measuring whether the policy is achieving its objective. He suggests that the Council should look again at the effectiveness of the monitoring framework.
- A5.10 In the draft Core Strategy a target was only included where it was quantifiable. However, having reviewed both the draft Core Strategy framework and those in other adopted Core Strategies it appears to be acceptable and appropriate to also include qualitative targets. Therefore, for a number of indicators qualitative targets are now proposed which give a clear indication of the direction of travel. For other indicators a quantitative target that could not previously be identified is proposed. These changes will result in a more effective monitoring framework (thereby addressing the Inspector's concern) and are set out in the schedule attached as Annex G.

Conclusion

That the changes referred to above and set out in the schedule of changes in annex G are agreed and published for public consultation.

Annex F: Changes to National Planning Policy

New Affordable Rent Tenancy (ART)

- A6.1 “Affordable Rent” is a new tenure for affordable housing introduced in to national policy earlier in 2011 under the coalition government. “Affordable rented housing” is rented housing provided by registered providers of social housing. It has the same characteristics as social rented housing except that it is outside the national rent regime – based instead on up to 80% of local market rents. It has the same controls in terms of eligible households as social rent.
- A6.2 Research has been undertaken by the Council to assess how this change to national policy should be incorporated into the Core Strategy. The findings suggest that this will not have such a positive impact in the B&NES area and that as such the existing Core Strategy tenure split is still appropriate. However, the Council will need to consider the provision of ART in lieu of social rent where a need is identified or where there is a positive impact on viability allowing policy compliant levels of affordable housing to be met. Minor changes to this effect will be needed to the Core Strategy to reflect the Government’s proposals on the new Affordable Rent system. The wording of the changes is included in the schedule of changes set out in annex G.

Draft National Planning Policy Framework

- A6.4 The Government has published a draft version of the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This NPPF entails a review of existing national planning policy and its replacement with a single national policy document. The NPPF is due to be adopted by the end of the year. The Government has made it clear that the NPPF will provide the basis for all local planning policy documents and every Development Management decision. Whilst the planning system remains plan led, there will be a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This means that if local plans or Core Strategies do not accord with the NPPF, planning permission should be granted.
- A6.5 The Core Strategy was prepared under the framework of existing national policy and so the Inspector has asked for an assessment to be undertaken of whether the B&NES draft Core Strategy accords with the draft NPPF. Following this assessment it is evident that there are a number of minor changes and clarifications that would be necessary and these can be considered through the LDF Steering Group before Council. The Inspector has also asked that these potential changes be consulted upon, alongside the changes made to the Core Strategy at this time.
- A6.6 Local Planning Authorities are still required to maintain a rolling supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing sites. However, the NPPF introduces a significant new requirement that the five year supply should include an additional allowance of at least 20% to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. The SHLAA will need to be updated to take this into account. If the SHLAA cannot demonstrate a five year +20% supply of housing land then the NPPF states that applications would be permitted in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- A6.7 This is a significant issue for B&NES and many other authorities because we do not have a five year +20% supply of housing land. The Council may want to object to this change as part of the public consultation on the NPPF.
- A6.8 Other main implications arising from the NPPF include:
- Incorporate the presumption in favour of sustainable development
 - Ensure that any ‘local standards’ within the Core Strategy do not threaten viability of development (eg ‘Building for Life’)

- Ensure that Core Strategy sustainable construction policies are consistent with the Government's zero carbon buildings policy. NPPF states we should adopt nationally described standards.
- Removing office development from 'town centre first' policy
- Removing the 60% brownfield target for housing development.
- Removing the maximum non-residential car parking standards for major developments
- Introduce a new protection for locally important green space that is not currently protected by any national designation.

A6.9 The schedule at the end of this annex sets out the likely changes that would need to be made to the Core Strategy to bring it in line with the draft NPPF. However, because the NPPF is only draft it is not considered appropriate to formally make changes to the Core Strategy at this stage. Instead, the schedule will be forwarded to the Inspector for consideration during the examination process and any necessary changes can be made through the examination process. The schedule of likely changes will also be subject to consultation alongside the proposed changes set out in annex G and referred to in paragraph 4.1 in the Council Report.

Conclusion

That the schedule of likely changes below are noted, subjected to public consultation and forwarded to the Inspector during the examination process

SCHEDULE OF LIKELY CHANGES ARISING FROM THE DRAFT NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (Annex F)

Ref	NPPF Policy Change	Page No. of Draft Core Strategy	Plan Ref.	Proposed Change	Significant or Minor
NPPF1	All plans should be based upon and contain the presumption in favour of sustainable development as their starting point		DW1	<p>District-wide spatial Strategy</p> <p>The overarching strategy for B&NES is to promote sustainable development by <u>There is a presumption in favour of sustainable development in B&NES. Sustainable development is promoted by:</u></p> <p>1: focussing new housing, jobs and community facilities in Bath, Keynsham, Midsomer Norton and Radstock particularly ensuring:</p> <p>a: there is the necessary modern office space in Bath within or adjoining the city centre to enable diversification of the economy whilst maintaining the unique heritage of the City</p> <p>b: sufficient space is available in Keynsham to reposition the town as a more significant business location whilst retaining its separate identity</p> <p>c: there is deliverable space to enable job growth in the towns and principal villages in the Somer Valley to create a thriving and vibrant area which is more self-reliant socially and economically</p> <p>d: development in rural areas is located at settlements with a good range of local facilities and with good access to public transport</p> <p>2: making provision for a net increase of 8,700</p>	Significant

			<p>jobs and 11,000 homes between 2006 and 2026, of which around 3,400 affordable homes will be delivered through the planning system</p> <p>3: prioritising the use of brownfield opportunities for new development in order to limit the need for development on greenfield sites</p> <p>4: retaining the general extent of Bristol - Bath Green Belt with no strategic change to the boundaries</p> <p>5: requiring development to be designed in a way that is resilient to the impacts of climate change</p> <p>6: protecting and enhancing the district's biodiversity resource including sites, habitats and species of European importance</p> <p>7: ensuring infrastructure is aligned with new development</p> <p>In order to respond to changing circumstances, flexibility in the nature, density and mix of uses in the Western Corridor of Bath and on MoD sites will provide contingency in line with the principles of the overall strategy.</p> <p>In order to respond to changing circumstances, flexibility in the nature, density and mix of uses in the Western Corridor of Bath and on MoD sites will provide contingency in line with the principles of the overall strategy</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

<p>NPPF2</p>	<p>Para 75. Avoid long term protection of employment land or floorspace etc</p> <p>Para 77. Sequential test applicable to retail and leisure development but not office development</p>		<p>B3</p> <p><i>Note re Para 75: Evidence based reason for protection of employment land in Newbridge Riverside. Policy framework is more flexible at Twerton Riverside and amended to reflect NPPF</i></p> <p>Changes from PC33</p> <p>4. Scope and Scale of Change</p> <p><i>Industrial land and premises</i></p> <p>(a i) There is a presumption in favour of retaining land at Newbridge Riverside for industrial use. Refurbishment, redevelopment or intensification will be welcomed.</p> <p>(a ii) Refurbishment, redevelopment or intensification for industrial use will be welcomed at Twerton Riverside.</p> <p>(a iii) Proposals for the loss of industrial land and floorspace at Twerton Riverside will be assessed against evidence of current and future demand, the availability of suitable alternative provision within Bath for displaced occupiers and the <u>relative need</u> benefits of <u>for</u> non industrial uses.</p> <p><i>Offices, other workspaces, <u>retailing and leisure uses</u> and other economic development uses</i></p> <p>(bj) Proposals for offices <u>and</u> other workspaces and other economic development uses</p>	<p>Significant</p>
--------------	---	--	--	--------------------

				<p>(including retailing) must have regard to the sequential and impact tests of PPS4. <u>should have regard to (aiii).</u></p> <p>(bii) <u>In addition, proposals for retailing and leisure uses should also have regard to 4ai-iii and the sequential and impact considerations of the NPPF</u></p> <p>Non-economic development uses</p> <p>(c i) Proposals for residential and other non economic development uses will be acceptable as part of mixed-use employment-economic development-led proposals.</p> <p>(c ii) Residential-led or non-economic development led proposals will be acceptable only where economically-led development would not be commercially viable or where retailing and leisure uses would fail the sequential and impact considerations tests of <u>the NPPF PPS4 or is not commercially viable.</u></p>	
NPPF3	National policy in relation to sequential approach on flood risk remains the same. However, change to policy would be needed to remove reference to PPS25.		CP5	<p>Flood Risk Management Development in the district will follow a sequential approach to flood risk management, avoiding inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding and directing development away from areas at highest risk in line with Government policy (PPS25). Any development in areas at risk of flooding will be expected to be safe throughout its lifetime, by incorporating mitigation measures, which may take the form of on-site flood defence works and / or a contribution towards or a commitment to</p>	Minor

				<p>undertake such off-site measures as may be necessary. All development will be expected to incorporate sustainable drainage systems to reduce surface water run-off and minimise its contribution to flood risks elsewhere. All development should be informed by the information and recommendations of the B&NES Strategic Flood Risk Assessments and Flood Risk Management Strategy.</p>	
NPPF4			<p>CP12, Delivery section</p>	<p><i>The place-based sections for Bath, Keynsham, Midsomer Norton and Radstock will set out more detail on the approach to the centres contained in those settlements.</i></p> <p><i>The boundaries for all of the centres listed within the hierarchy are defined on the Proposals Map. Other than the Bath city centre boundary these boundaries reflect those established in the Bath & North East Somerset Local Plan. The Placemaking Plan will review these boundaries and identify sites for development. It will also review and define, where appropriate, the primary shopping areas and retail frontages in the larger centres. These designations will be supported by development management policies in the Placemaking Plan to guide decisions on individual planning applications.</i></p> <p><i>An updated retail study will be undertaken during 2010/11 to support future planning decisions and guide the Placemaking Plan.</i></p> <p><i>PPS4 'Planning for Sustainable Economic Development' contains national planning policies towards development in town centres and for</i></p>	Significant

DRAFT

				<i>economic development in general which are a material consideration and will inform decisions on specific proposals. <u>Retail and leisure uses will be subject to the sequential and impact tests set out in the NPPF.</u></i>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

ANNEX G

**Bath and North East Somerset
Draft Core Strategy**


Composite Schedule of Significant Changes

September 2011

Introduction

The schedule below outlines further proposed “significant” changes to the draft Core Strategy. These changes result from issues raised through the [preliminary comments and questions from the Inspector \(ID/1\)](#) appointed to conduct the Core Strategy Examination and are in addition to those incorporated in the [Schedule of Proposed Changes \(March 2011\)](#) approved under the delegated arrangement agreed by Council on 2 December 2010. Deletions of existing text are shown as strike through and additional text is shown as underlined.

Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change
20	Para 1.36	<p>1.36 Contingency: The Core strategy recognises the need to be responsive in light of future uncertainty and unforeseen circumstances. There is the scope for flexibility in the mix of uses and density of some of the large redevelopment sites such as at Somerdale in Keynsham and the MoD sites in Bath. In addition, there is scope in Bath’s western corridor to vary the mix of uses to respond to needs for development. This flexibility maintains the overall strategy of a priority on urban focussed brownfield opportunities. The Council will monitor delivery rates in the plan period which will shape the early review of the Core Strategy which is programmed for around 2016. <u>The Core Strategy is based on the regeneration of brownfield land and the Council is not planning for the release of land from the Green Belt to meet development needs. However, if after the first 5 years following adoption, monitoring demonstrates that the planned housing provision has not been delivered at the levels expected, the use of some Green Belt land at Hicks Gate as a long-term contingency for the development of new homes will be considered. This will require close liaison with Bristol City Council</u></p>
20	Policy DW1	<p><i>Add the wording below to Policy DW1:</i></p> <p><u>Contingency</u></p> <p><u>If monitoring shows that planned housing provision will not be delivered at the levels expected the use of some Green Belt land at Hicks Gate as a long-term contingency for the development of new homes will be considered.</u></p> <p><u>The broad location is indicated on the Key Diagram.</u></p>

Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change
21	Diagram 4	<p>Amendment to Diagram 4 (Key Diagram) to show housing contingency allocation</p>  <p>The map displays the following data points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keynsham: 1,500 homes, 1,500 jobs Rural Areas: 800 homes, 500 jobs Bath: 6,000 homes, 5,700 jobs New contingency Housing location: Indicated by a blue circle and yellow highlight near Keynsham. <p>Other labeled locations include Bristol, Whitchurch, Salford, Farmborough, Timsbury, Temple Cloud, Somer Valley, Peasedown, Bathford, and Batheaston.</p>
33	Diagram 5	Delete notation and label for East of Bath Park & Ride (NEW)

Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change
40	Policy B2	<p>Amend Policy B2 as follows:</p> <p><u>3. Key Development Opportunities</u></p> <p>Figure 7 illustrates the general extent of the city centre, identifies neighbouring areas with the most capacity for significant change and key regeneration opportunities. The precise extent of the city centre, including that of the primary shopping area is shown in the proposals map (see Appendix 3). Within the context of PPS4, <u>economic development led</u> mixed use development proposals at the following locations that accord with parts 1 and 2 of policy B2 and contribute to the scope and scale of change listed in part '4' of this policy will be welcomed.</p> <p>Remainder of Policy B2 remains unchanged.</p>
48	Para 2.21	<p>It is beyond the remit of this chapter of the Core Strategy to consider local aspects of change within outer Bath and to present a bespoke neighbourhood plan for each area. A number of general matters, such as the network of open spaces and other infrastructure are covered in the Core Policies section. The spatial strategy focuses on key areas or issues requiring strategic guidance. Core Strategy Policy in relation to a number of generic matters /topics is covered in the Core Policies section. The spatial strategy focuses on key areas or issues requiring strategic guidance. Crucially, suburban Bath is expected to yield about 2,500 <u>2800</u> new homes, making a significant contribution to the overall target of 6,000 and contains <u>a district centre</u> and local centres that need to be identified as part of the retail hierarchy.</p>
56	Paras 2.44 to 2.46	<p>2.44 The Council has secured programme entry for a £54m major scheme of Transport Proposals for Bath and is currently working towards full Government approval. The Transport Proposals will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand the City's three existing Park & Rides and create a new Park & Ride to the east of the City, thereby increasing Park & Ride capacity from 1,990 to 4,510 spaces • Create a segregated park and ride bus route for 1.4km of the journey from Newbridge Park and Ride to the city centre. • Upgrade nine bus routes to 'showcase' standard including raised kerbs for better access, off-bus ticketing to speed up boarding and real time electronic information for passengers. • Create a more pedestrian and cyclist friendly city centre through the introduction of access changes on a number of streets and the expansion and enhancement of pedestrian areas.

Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce active traffic management with real-time information to direct drivers to locations where parking spaces are available. <p>2.45 The proposals will help to enable the programme of development set out in the spatial strategy in conjunction with further measures to enable convenient and sustainable circulation and access within the city. In addition the Council is committed to reducing the need to use cars for many trips within Bath. Therefore improvements to other public transport, walking and cycling infrastructure and the implementation of 'Smarter Choices' for transport will be pursued e.g. through the development of travel plans for new and existing sites and the expansion of car clubs.</p> <p>2.46 The Greater Bristol Metro Project will allow for increased train frequencies serving Bath and Oldfield Park rail stations.</p> <p><u>2.44 The Council's Transport Strategy for Bath is one of reducing the use of cars for travelling to and within the city, by progressing improvements to public transport and making walking or cycling within the city the preferred option for short trips. This will be achieved through a variety of measures including:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Bath Transport Package – comprising a range of measures including three extended Park & Ride sites; upgrading nine bus routes to showcase standard including upgrades to bus stop infrastructure and variable message signs on key routes into the city displaying information about car parking availability</u> • <u>Improvements to the bus network through the Greater Bristol Bus Network major scheme including key routes from Bristol and Midsomer Norton,</u> • <u>Rail improvements, such as the electrification of Great Western Railway mainline by 2016; the new 15 year GWR franchise (including the Greater Bristol Metro Project); and increasing the capacity of local rail services travelling through Bath Spa rail station, improving ease of access to and attractiveness of rail travel to and from Bath</u> • <u>The West of England authorities (including B&NES) have been awarded Local Sustainable Transport</u>

Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change
		<p><u>Fund key component funding for a number of measures and also been invited by the Department for Transport to submit a major bid to the Local Sustainable Transport Fund for £25.5million</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Creating a more pedestrian and cyclist-friendly city centre through the introduction of access changes on a number of streets and expansion and enhancement of pedestrian areas.</u> • <u>Other improvements to walking and cycling infrastructure through the Councils Integrated Transport annual settlement and the implementation of 'Smarter Choices' for transport e.g. through the development of travel plans for new and existing sites and the expansion of car clubs</u> <p><u>2.45 To complement these public transport and cycling/walking improvements the Council will update its Parking Strategy for Bath which will broadly maintain central area car parking at existing levels in the short term and continue to prioritise management of that parking for short and medium stay users. This is necessary in order to discourage car use for commuting and provide sufficient parking to help maintain the vitality and viability of the city centre as a shopping and visitor destination. It will also result in a relative reduction in the amount of central area parking that is available as the economy grows, jobs are created and demand increases.</u></p> <p><u>2.46 The proposals set out above will help to enable the programme of development set out in the spatial strategy to be delivered in a way that minimises travel related environmental and air quality harm whilst providing convenient and sustainable access within the city.</u></p>
57	Table 5	IDP Ref Key Infrastructure Phasing Cost

Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change
		<p>Funding and Delivery</p> <p>Bl.1</p> <p>Transport Proposals for Bath:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rapid Transit Routes • New showcase bus corridors • New and eExtended park and ride sites • <u>Upgraded bus stop infrastructure on 9 service routes</u> • Safe routes for pedestrians and cyclists • Other essential transport links and improvements <p>2011-16</p> <p>£54m-£50.1m</p> <p><u>£31.85m</u></p> <p><u>Discussions are underway with DfT in the light of the Comprehensive Spending Review 2010 regarding how this essential infrastructure can be brought forward at the earliest opportunity. Bath Transport Package accepted into 'development pool' of schemes by DfT. Final-bid to be submitted for funding to DfT in September 2011. DfT decision anticipated in December 2011.</u></p> <p>Bl.2</p>

Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change
		<p>Improvements to Flood Defences of Bath City Centre and Riverside</p> <p>2010-26</p> <p>£7.6m</p> <p>Flood Risk Management Strategy – ongoing work between B&NES and Environment Agency. Options for on-site compensatory flood mitigation measures within the river corridor or introduction of a more strategic flood storage area.</p> <p>Bl.3</p> <p>Public Investment into Bath Western Riverside</p> <p>2010-15</p> <p>£27.6m</p> <p>Homes and Communities Agency Funding through the West of England Single Conversation: West of England Delivery and Infrastructure Plan.</p> <p>Bl.4</p> <p>Improvements to Bath Train Station and Enhanced Service Frequency from Bath and Oldfield Park to Bristol</p> <p>2017-2020</p> <p>£19.7m for Greater Bristol Metro Rail Project</p> <p>Network Rail with Bath & North East Somerset Council. Evidence included in the Great Western Mainline Route Utilisation Strategy (2010). The Council Will continue to press for this urgently needed investment</p>


Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change
		through its Memorandum of Understanding with the Rail industry.
96	Para 5.17	<p>A number of villages have been identified where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • access to facilities and public transport is best • there is capacity for development • there is community support for some small scale development <p>These villages are to be the focus for new small scale development under policy RA1. Community support is demonstrated by the views of the Parish Council as the locally elected representative of those communities.</p>
96	Para 5.18	<p>The villages which currently meet these criteria <u>set out in policy RA1</u> and that have some capacity for development are: Batheaston, Bishop Sutton, Farmborough, Temple Cloud, Timsbury and Whitchurch. These villages are shown on the diagram 18. This indicative list of villages <u>may be subject to change over the lifetime of the Core Strategy. It will be formally reviewed as part of</u> will be included in the review of the Core Strategy and consideration will be given to any demonstrated change of circumstances against the criteria in the interim. <u>Local community support for the principle of development is demonstrated by the views of the Parish Council as the locally elected representative of those communities or through alternative mechanisms introduced in the Localism Bill.</u></p>
99	Para 5.29	<p>This policy will apply to all market housing developments across the District. Villages which meet the criteria of policy RA1 will benefit from this policy and sites will be allocated through the Placemaking Plan. Beyond this, local need for affordable housing across the rural areas will be primarily met through the rural exceptions policy. There may also be opportunities to convert rural buildings into affordable housing under the Government's emerging proposals for the 'home on the farm' scheme. If there are rural buildings which are no longer required for local food production, there may also be opportunities to convert them to affordable housing under the Government's emerging proposals for the 'home on the farm' scheme. Any development proposals coming forward under the Community Right to Build are to be considered separately from the rural exceptions policy.</p>

Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change
101	Para 5.49	Private developers will play an important role in bringing forward and developing small scale housing developments in the 'Policy RA1' villages and to the delivery of employment sites. Further assessment of the potential for development in Farmborough to help fund a sustainable transport link to local shopping facilities also needs to be undertaken through the Placemaking Plan.
106	Policy CP1 (as amended by PC8)	<p>Retrofitting measures to existing buildings to improve their energy efficiency and adaptability to climate change and the appropriate incorporation of micro-renewables will be encouraged.</p> <p>Priority will be given to facilitating carbon reduction through retrofitting at whole street or neighbourhood scales to reduce costs, improve viability and support coordinated programmes of improvement.</p> <p>Masterplanning and 'major development' (as defined in the Town & Country Planning (Development Management Procedure (England) Order 2010) in the district should demonstrate that opportunities for the retention and retrofitting of existing buildings <u>within the site</u> have been included within the scheme. All schemes should consider retrofitting opportunities as part of their design brief and measures to support this will be introduced.</p> <p>Retrofitting Historic Buildings</p> <p>The Council will seek to encourage and enable the sensitive retrofitting of energy efficiency measures and the appropriate use of micro-renewables in historic buildings (including listed buildings and buildings of solid wall or traditional construction) and in conservation areas, whilst safeguarding the special characteristics of these heritage assets for the future.</p> <p>Proposals will be considered against national planning policy.</p>
107	Policy CP2	<p>Sustainable design and construction will be integral to new development in Bath & North East Somerset. All planning applications should include evidence that the standards below will be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximising energy efficiency and integrating the use of renewable and low-carbon energy <u>(i.e. in the form of an energy strategy with reference to policy CP4 as necessary)</u>;

Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimisation of waste and recycling during construction and in operation; • Conserving water resources and minimising vulnerability to flooding; • Efficiency in materials use, including the type, life cycle and source of materials to be used; • Flexibility and adaptability, allowing future modification of use or layout, facilitating future refurbishment and retrofitting; • Consideration of climate change adaptation. <p>Applications for all development other than major development will need to be accompanied by a B&NES Sustainable Construction Checklist</p> <p><u>Major Development</u></p> <p>For major development a BREEAM and/or Code for Sustainable Homes (CfSH) (or equivalent) pre-assessment will be required alongside a Planning Application. Post-construction assessments will also be required. These assessments must be undertaken by an accredited assessor.</p> <p>The standards set out in the table below will be requirements for major development over the plan period:</p> <p><u>An exception to these standards will only be made where it can be demonstrated that meeting the provisions of this policy would render development unviable.</u></p>
109	New para	<p><u>New para after 6.24 (6.25):</u></p> <p><u>Any impact of this policy on the viability of schemes will be given careful consideration.</u></p>
110	Policy CP4	<p>The use of combined heat and power (CHP), and/or combined cooling, heat and power (CCHP) and district heating will be encouraged. Within the identified “district heat priority areas”, shown on diagram 19, development will be expected to incorporate infrastructure for district heating, and will be expected to connect to existing systems where and when this is available, <u>unless demonstrated that this would render development</u></p>

Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change
		<p><u>unviable.</u></p> <p>Masterplanning and major development in the district should demonstrate a thermal masterplanning approach considering efficiency/opportunity issues such as mix of uses, anchor loads, density and heat load profiles to maximise opportunities for the use of district heating.</p> <p>The Council will expect all major developments to demonstrate that the proposed heating and cooling systems (CHP/CCHP) have been selected considering the heat hierarchy, in line with the following order of preference:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Connection with existing CHP/CCHP distribution networks 2 Site wide CHP/CCHP fed by renewables 3 Gas-fired CHP/CCHP or hydrogen fuel cells, both accompanied by renewables 4 Communal CHP/CCHP fuelled by renewable energy sources 5 Gas fired CHP/CCHP
114	Para 6.37	<p>All development schemes with a residential component Housing schemes will be assessed using the expected to demonstrate how they have been designed to meet Building for Life methodology standards (or equivalent, as identified by the Council, should these be superseded within the strategy period). The Council will expect proposals to achieve as a minimum, a 'good' standard as defined by BfL or an equivalent future standard.</p>
117	Policy CP6	<p>1 High Quality Design</p> <p>The distinctive quality, character and diversity of Bath and North East Somerset's environmental assets will be promoted, protected, conserved or enhanced through:</p> <p>a high quality and inclusive design which reinforces and contributes to its specific local context, creating attractive, inspiring and safe places.</p>

Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change
		<p>b All ensuring that all major housing development schemes with a residential component should be assessed using the Building for Life design assessment tool (or equivalent methodology) meet GABE's. As a guide development should meet its "good" standard. Building for Life (BfL) good standard, as a minimum.</p> <p><i>Note: Rest of policy CP6 remains unchanged.</i></p>
120	Para 6.64	<p>In light of the opportunities for development in the plan period Keynsham continues to be excluded from the Green Belt and an Inset boundary is defined on the Proposals Map. There are a number of villages which meet the requirements of national policy in PPG2 'Green Belts' para 2.11 and continue to be insets within the Green Belt as established in the Bath & North East Somerset Local Plan. These villages are these which are the most sustainable <u>villages in the Green Belt rural locations</u> for accommodating <u>some</u> limited new development in the plan period <u>under the provisions of either policy RA1 where the criteria are met, or where not, policy RA2.</u> There are no exceptional circumstances which would justify amending these Inset boundaries and therefore, they remain unchanged. Some sites may come forward in the Green Belt under the Government's proposals for Community Right to Build.</p>
121	Minerals Para 6.66	<p>Amend section on Minerals with new policy as follows:</p> <p>Limestone is the principal commercial mineral worked in the District. There are currently two active sites – one surface workings and one underground mine. Upper Lawn Quarry at Combe Down in Bath and Hayes Wood mine near Limpley Stoke both produce high quality Bath Stone building and renovation projects. <u>Bath & North East Somerset also has a legacy of coal mining and there are also still coal resources within Bath & North East Somerset which are capable of extraction by surface mining techniques. Although no longer worked, there are potential public safety and land stability issues associated with these areas. The general extent of the surface coal Mineral Safeguarding Area within the District is illustrated in Diagram 20a.</u></p> <p>Historically Bath & North East Somerset has never made any significant contribution to regional aggregates supply and because of the scale and nature of the mineral operations in the District and the geology of the area it is considered that this situation will continue. Bristol is also in no position to make a</p>

Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change
	New Diagram	 <p>Coal Resource Areas</p> <p><u>Diagram 20a: General extent of the surface coal Mineral Safeguarding Area (based on data supplied by the Coal Authority, 2009)</u></p> <p>The diagram shows a map of a region with a black outline. It features several areas: a large central area with pink diagonal hatching, several smaller areas with orange shading, and a few blue-shaded areas. A legend at the bottom left shows a pink hatched square next to the text 'Coal Resource Areas'. The map also shows a network of blue lines representing rivers and some grey areas representing water bodies.</p>

Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change
120	Preamble to Green Belt Policy CP8	<p><i>Amend Para 6.63 as follows</i></p> <p>"6.63 Core Policy CP8 conforms to national policy which also states that the general extent and detailed boundaries of the Green Belt should be altered only exceptionally. The Core Strategy does not envisage that the general extent of the Green Belt in B&NES should be altered in the plan period. This reflects the very high value attached by the communities in bath & North east Somerset to the openness of the Green Belt. However Policy DW1 acknowledges that should the need be clearly demonstrated at the review of the Core Strategy in around 2016, land is identified as a housing contingency at Hicks gate on the edge of Bristol.</p>
123	Policy CP9	<p>Amend Policy CP9 to as follows:</p> <p>Large sites</p> <p>Affordable housing will be required as on-site provision in developments of 10 dwellings or 0.5 hectare (whichever is the lower) and above. An average affordable housing percentage of 35% will be sought on these large development sites. This is on a grant free basis with the presumption that on site provision is expected.</p> <p>Small sites</p> <p>Residential developments on small sites from 5 to 9 dwellings or from 0.25 up to 0.49 hectare (whichever is the lower) should provide either on site provision or an appropriate financial contribution towards the provision of affordable housing with commuted sum calculations. The target level of affordable housing for these small sites will be 17.5%, half that of large sites, in order to encourage delivery.</p> <p>In terms of the 17.5% affordable housing on small sites, the Council will first consider if on site provision is appropriate. In many instances, particularly in the urban areas of Bath, Keynsham, Midsomer Norton and Radstock the Council will accept a commuted sum in lieu of on site provision. This should be agreed with housing and planning officers at an early stage.</p>

Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change
		<p><u>Viability</u></p> <p><u>For both large and small sites the viability of the proposed development should be taken into account, including:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Whether the site is likely to have market values materially above or below the average for the district</u> • <u>Whether grant or other public subsidy is available</u> • <u>Whether there are exceptional build or other development costs</u> • <u>The achievement of other planning objectives</u> • <u>The tenure and size mix of the affordable housing to be provided</u> <p><u>A higher (up to 45%) proportion of affordable housing may be sought or provision below the average of 35% may be accepted.</u></p> <p>Higher affordable housing proportions (up to a maximum of 45%) may be sought in individual cases, taking account of:</p> <p>a whether the site benefits from above average market values for the district;</p> <p>b whether grant or other public investment may be available to help achieve additional affordable housing.</p> <p>In some cases the scheme viability may justify the Council accepting a grant free provision of</p> <p>affordable housing below the average of 35%. This may be applicable on schemes where market values are significantly below the district average or where the build costs are exceptionally high and taking into account whether grant or other public investment may be available.</p>

Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change
		<p>Sub-division and phasing</p> <p>Where it is proposed to phase development or sub-divide sites, or where only part of a site is subject to a planning application, the Council will take account of the whole of the site when determining whether it falls above or below the thresholds set out above.</p> <p>Tenure</p> <p>The tenure of the affordable housing will typically be based on a 75/25 split between social rent and intermediate housing.</p> <p><u>The Council will consider the provision of affordable rent or other affordable housing products in lieu of social rent when it is proven necessary to improve viability in order to achieve policy position levels of affordable housing and where the housing need for affordable rent can be demonstrated.</u></p> <p>Property Size and Mix</p> <p>Residential developments delivering on-site affordable housing should provide a mix of affordable housing units and contribute to the creation of mixed, balanced and inclusive communities. The size and type of affordable units will be determined by the Council to reflect the identified housing needs and site suitability.</p> <p>The type and size profile of the affordable housing will be guided by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and other local housing requirements but the Council will aim for at least 60% of the affordable housing to be family houses including some large 4/5 bed dwellings.</p> <p>Other</p>

Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change
		All affordable housing units delivered through this policy should remain at an affordable price for future eligible households. Affordable Housing should be integrated within a development and should not be distinguishable from market housing.
124-125	<p>Para 6.81</p> <p>Para 6.82</p> <p>New para 6.82a</p> <p>New para 6.82b</p>	<p>Gypsies, Travellers & Travelling Showpeople</p> <p>Local Development Frameworks must consider the accommodation needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople. <u>There is currently a national and local shortage of authorised sites for these communities. Taking steps to address this will help to improve access to services for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople (including health care, schools and shops) and also help to reduce conflicts that can arise from the setting up of unauthorised camps.</u></p> <p>Gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople are not one single group and their differing cultural needs relating to residential homes and stopping places must be considered. There are currently no authorised gypsy and traveller sites within the District.</p> <p>The West of England Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (WoE GTAA) undertaken in 2007 investigates accommodation requirements of the gypsy and travelling communities in B&NES for the period 2006-2014. <u>recommends that 19 permanent pitches and 20 transit pitches are found for the gypsy and travelling communities in Bath & North East Somerset for the period to 2011. The WoE GTAA also indicates that one plot is provided for travelling showpeople in Bath & North East Somerset for this period.</u></p> <p>Provision for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople will be decided in line with Circulars 01/2006 'Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites' and 04/2007 'Planning for Travelling Showpeople'. These Circulars state that a criterion based approach needs to be taken in the Core Strategy when looking at the location of sites. Core Policy CP11 sets out the criteria to <u>The Council will identify suitable and deliverable sites to meet the established accommodation needs of gypsies, travelers and travelling showpeople through separate Development Plan Documents (DPDs) for the period to 2011. The criteria in Policy CP11 will be used to guide the identification of suitable sites for inclusion in the relevant DPDs and to identify sites meet future accommodation needs when assessed. These criteria will also be used when considering planning applications that may happen before the DPDs are prepared or in addition to sites being allocated.</u></p>

Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change
	Policy CP11	<p>POLICY CP11 - GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS & TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE</p> <p><u>The following criteria will be used to guide the identification of suitable sites to meet the established accommodation needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople to 2011 and their accommodation needs beyond 2011 once assessed.</u></p> <p>Proposals for sites for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople accommodation will be considered against the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a: local community services and facilities, including shops, schools and health facilities, should be accessible by foot, cycle and public transport b: satisfactory means of access can be provided and the existing highway network is adequate to service the site c: the site is large enough to allow for adequate space for on-site facilities and amenity, parking and manoeuvring, as well as any commercial activity if required d: the site does not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area e: adequate services including utilities, foul and surface water and waste disposal can be provided as well as any necessary pollution control measures f: use of the site must have no harmful impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers g: the site should avoid areas at high risk of flooding and have no adverse impact on protected habitats and species, nationally recognised designations and natural resources <p><i>Delivery:</i></p> <p><u>Delivery will be through the Development Management process. Sites will be identified through the Gypsies and Travellers DPD to meet identified accommodation needs up to 2011 and beyond once assessed.</u></p>

Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change
134	Para 7.04	<p><u>Progress against</u> many objectives/policies can be measured quantitatively and this is <u>reflected in the targets</u> set out in the framework below. <u>Where appropriate the target is set out in a way that will help to inform review of the Core Strategy in accordance with the programme set out in paragraph 7.05 below.</u> However, others <u>objectives/policies</u> do not lend themselves to <u>this quantification and where appropriate a qualitative target is included in order to enable performance is to be measured in a different way.</u> Monitoring performance against the indicators set out is principally undertaken through the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). The AMR is published in December each year and in addition to setting out monitoring information includes analysis of whether and how the policies are being delivered. In so doing it will inform the process of Core Strategy policy review and provides evidence to inform formulation of policies in other Local Development Documents.</p>
134	New para 7.07	<p>Monitoring & Review Add new para 7.07</p> <p>“7.07 The need for the contingency development area at Hicks Gate will not be considered before April 2016. If, at April 2016 or at a date thereafter, the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, to the extent that there is a shortfall of 1000 or more units, it accepts that the need for the contingency development area will be triggered, unless additional brownfield housing land supply can be identified as being available and developable beyond the next 5 years”.</p>
135	Table 9	Amend heading of column 4 from ‘Quantification of objective’ to <u>‘Target’</u>
135	Table 9	Amend the ‘Target’ column for the respective indicators for strategic objective 1 and Policy CP1 to read: <u>Increase in the number of residential and non-residential properties that have installed photovoltaic cells</u>
136	Table 9	Amend the ‘Target’ column for the respective indicators for strategic objective 2 and Policy CP6 to read: <u>Maintain or increase the area of priority habitats by 2026</u> <u>Annual increase in the proportion of assessed housing schemes that meet the Building for Life (BfL) good standard</u> <u>Reduce the number of principal listed buildings recorded as ‘at risk’ on the Council’s Buildings at Risk Register</u>

Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change
		<u>Increase the number of up to date Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans in place</u>
136	Table 9	<p>Amend the 'Indicator' column for strategic objective 4 and Policy CP12 to read:</p> <p><u>Health of the centres as indicated by</u> retail floorspace losses, vacancy rates and land use mix changes in each of the centres listed in the hierarchy (city/town centres – annually and district/local centres – periodically)</p> <p>Amend the 'Target' column for the indicator above for strategic objective 4 and Policy CP12 to read:</p> <p><u>Health of each centre as measured by the indicators specified is maintained or enhanced</u></p> <p>Amend the 'Indicator' column by adding the following indicator for strategic objective 4 and Policy CP12:</p> <p><u>Market share of comparison goods spending in Bath city centre and the town centres</u></p> <p>Amend the 'Target' column for the indicator above to read:</p> <p><u>The market share of comparison goods spending as measured by household surveys undertaken about every 5 years is maintained or enhanced</u></p>
	Table 9	<p>Amend the 'Target' column for the respective indicator for strategic objective 5 and Policy DW1 to read:</p> <p><u>National target of 60%</u></p> <p><u>At least 80% of new housing provided between 2006 and 2026 should be on previously developed land</u></p>
	Table 9	<p>Amend the 'Target' column for the respective indicator for strategic objective 5 and Policy CP9 to read:</p> <p><u>3,400 affordable homes completed by 2026</u></p> <p>Average of 35% of <u>all</u> homes provided on large sites across the District <u>should be affordable homes</u></p>

Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change
	Table 9	Amend the 'Target' column for the indicator for strategic objective 5 and Policy CP11 to read: <u>Delivery of 22 permanent and 20 transit pitches for Gypsies and Travellers by 2016</u>
	Table 9	Amend the 'Target' column for the Air Quality indicator for strategic objective 6 and Policy CP13 to read: <u>By 2016 within the Bath AQMA and Keynsham AQMA annual average concentrations of Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) not to exceed 40µg/m³</u>
	Table 9	Amend the 'Indicator' column for strategic objective 7 to read: 47 <u>11 transport related targets indicators</u> are monitored as part of JLTP3. <u>http://www.travelplus.org.uk/media/187017/12%20targets%20and%20monitoring.pdf(page2)</u>