



## Bath and North East Somerset Core Strategy

### Sustainability Appraisal Report Annex M



### Volume 2: Screening of Main Modifications and Additional Modifications to Submitted Core Strategy

Prepared for:  
**Bath & North East Somerset Council**

Prepared by:  
**ENVIRON**  
Exeter, UK

Date:  
**July 2014**

Project or Issue Number:  
**UK18-20268**

Contract No:	UK18-20268
Issue:	4
Author (signature):	E Jones / V Pearson  
Project Manager/Director (signature):	J Curran  
Date:	July 2014

*This report has been prepared by ENVIRON with all reasonable skill, care and diligence, and taking account of the Services and the Terms agreed between ENVIRON and the Client. This report is confidential to the client, and ENVIRON accepts no responsibility whatsoever to third parties to whom this report, or any part thereof, is made known, unless formally agreed by ENVIRON beforehand. Any such party relies upon the report at their own risk.*

*ENVIRON disclaims any responsibility to the Client and others in respect of any matters outside the agreed scope of the Services.*

<b>Version Control Record</b>				
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Description of Status</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Reviewer Initials</b>	<b>Author Initials</b>
A	First Draft	14/02/13		VP
B	Second Draft	15/03/13		EJ
1	Draft to client	19/03/13	LV	EJ
2	Draft to client	25/03/2013	LV	EJ
3	Final Report	25/03/2013	LV	EJ
4	Draft Final Report incorporating main and additional mods	02/07/14	JC	VP

## Contents

3	Results of Screening: Main Modifications to the Submitted Core Strategy June 2014	1
4	Results of Screening: Additional Modifications June 2014	79

### Volume 1

1	Introduction	
2	Results of Screening: Proposed Changes March 2013	

### 3 Results of Screening: Main Modifications to the Submitted Core Strategy June 2014

This schedule presented in Table M,3.1 sets out Main Modifications to the Submitted Core Strategy that are necessary for 'soundness'. These Modifications are expressed as changes to the Submitted Core Strategy.

The Main Modification reference used in the report is set out in the first column.

The source of each change used in previous consultations is indicated in the second column of the schedule 'Origin of the Change' (see Section 1 Volume 1 for further information).

The third column indicates the Plan reference (policy, paragraph, diagram, table etc.) and page number in the Draft Core Strategy (December 2011).

The fourth column shows all changes to the Submitted Core Strategy (see Section 1 Volume 1 for explanation).

The fifth column shows the results of the screening for significant effects for the SA undertaken in June/July 2014.

Please note that deletions to existing text are shown as ~~strike through~~ and additional text is shown as underlined. The Inspector's modifications June 2014 are shown in **highlighted** text within Table M3.1.

In order not to duplicate the previous table in this annex, the main modifications are shown in isolation from the previous proposed changes (in Table M2.1 in Volume 1).

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
MM1	-	The Spatial Vision (page 14) Paragraphs 6 and 8 only	<p><b>The Spatial Vision - <i>What the Spatial Strategy Seeks to Achieve</i></b></p> <p><del>The</del> delivery of new housing on brownfield sites is a vital component of the vision and will help to create a <del>more</del>-sustainable relationship between the city's labour and job markets and support Bath's economic potential. <del>whilst retaining the integrity of its landscape.</del> Parallel investment in public transport infrastructure and walking and cycling will keep the city moving and enable more sustainable travel choices to be made.</p> <p>Keynsham is a historic town that occupies a strategically important location between Bristol and Bath and is therefore well placed to improve and attract investment. It will continue to act as a market town and service centre for the surrounding area. In responding to the loss of a major employer, it will evolve as a more significant business location. Keynsham will <u>expand to accommodate a growing population, ensuring it</u> retains its independence and its separate identity within an attractive rural setting. It will become a more sustainable, desirable and well-connected place in which to live and work, with an enhanced town centre inspired by its heritage and cherished rivers, park and green spaces.</p> <p>.</p>	<p>Changes already appraised in March 2013.</p> <p>No implications for final SA.</p>
MM5	SPC12	Para 1.21	<p>Change not needed for soundness.</p> <p><b><i>Environmental capacity:</i></b> The District is renowned for its outstanding environment. Bath is the only complete city in the UK which is inscribed as a World Heritage Site; the high quality of the landscape is recognised by the designation of two Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty; there are over 50 Conservation Areas in the district and Bath has the highest concentration of Listed Buildings outside of Westminster. The District also enjoys a rich and diverse biodiversity resource, including many protected species and habitats and <del>two</del> <u>includes or is adjacent to a number of</u> sites of European importance for bats and wetland birds. <u>These European Sites are protected through</u></p>	<p>Para 1.21 included in the Schedule of Additional Mods - appraised in March 2013</p> <p>No implications for final SA.</p>

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications																			
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening															
			<p>the Habitat Regulations. In this context bats are a significant issue as the District supports <u>important bat foraging areas, commuting routes and roosts of importance to the integrity of up to 3 European Sites. For clarity, development likely to have a significant effect on a European site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, and which cannot be adequately mitigated, would not be in accordance with the development plan.</u> The Council has assessed the impact of various policy proposals and alternative options on the Environment through the sustainability appraisal, the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) and locational investigations.</p>																
MM8	<p>CSA6 (SPC14, RC2)</p> <p>BNES/56 With further amendments</p>	Paras 1.26 a-d	<p><b>1.26 Scale and location of growth:</b></p> <p><i>Delete all existing text in para 1.26 and insert:</i></p> <p><b>1.26a</b> Based on the demographic projections in the SHMA, there is <u>need for about 9,000 new dwellings over the plan period, of which about one third is for affordable housing (See Column B in Table 1A below).</u></p> <p><b>Table 1A – Objectively assessed need for housing</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>A Local Plan Backlog 1996-2011</th> <th>B Demographic Need 2011-2029</th> <th>Sub – Total A + B</th> <th>Total assessed needs</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Market housing</td> <td>757</td> <td>6,075</td> <td>6,832</td> <td>9,646</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Affordable</td> <td>410</td> <td>2,880</td> <td>3,290</td> <td>3,290</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		A Local Plan Backlog 1996-2011	B Demographic Need 2011-2029	Sub – Total A + B	Total assessed needs	Market housing	757	6,075	6,832	9,646	Affordable	410	2,880	3,290	3,290	<p>The changes since November 2013 are a clearer articulation of housing need and explanation of the spatial strategy to accommodate it. At November 2013 figures were set out separately on requirement and supply/delivery which was confusing. The</p>
	A Local Plan Backlog 1996-2011	B Demographic Need 2011-2029	Sub – Total A + B	Total assessed needs															
Market housing	757	6,075	6,832	9,646															
Affordable	410	2,880	3,290	3,290															

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications								
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change					SA screening
			<u>housing</u>					headline figure of housing need/provision remains the same at around 12,960 and the spatial strategy the same. Therefore, this does not have significant implications for SA.
			<u>Total housing</u>	<u>1,167</u>	<u>8955</u>	<u>10,122</u>	<u>12,956</u>	
			<p><u>1.26b</u> Table 1A shows that the supply of market housing has been increased to enable the delivery of the full assessed need for affordable housing. This is necessary because much of the supply of market housing (built, committed, and small windfall sites) will not yield affordable housing.</p> <p><u>1.26c</u> In addition, the NPPF requires that when assessing need, full account is taken of market and economic signals. The increase in market housing above the figure derived from the demographic projections is a necessary market adjustment given the character of the housing market in the district and particularly at Bath.</p> <p><u>1.26d</u> The assessment of housing needs is based on two important assumptions. Firstly, the SHMA assumes that the expected modest growth in the student population at Bath's two universities will be accommodated in the planned growth of mainly on-campus new student accommodation. If the provision of purpose-built student accommodation does not keep up with the growth in the resident student population, more market housing will be needed because of the pressure on the private letting market. Secondly, the SHMA assumes that the contribution to the provision of affordable housing needs from private rented accommodation where occupiers are receiving housing benefit will continue at a similar scale in the future. If this contribution were to significantly fall, the need for new affordable housing would increase.</p>					

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
			<p><u>1.26e</u> The Council intends to meet in full the total assessed need of about 13,000 dwellings. Thus the housing requirement identified in the Plan which it seeks to deliver is also about 13,000 dwellings. It is against the requirement of 13,000 that the five-year supply of housing will be maintained. The 13,000 is not intended as a cap on housing delivery. For example, additional large windfall sites may come forward for development or the contribution to supply assumed to come from small windfall sites may be exceeded.</p> <p><u>1.26f</u> In order to meet the economic growth aspirations, the Plan also enables the delivery of around 10,300 new jobs.</p> <p><u>1.26g</u> The spatial distribution of housing across the District is set out in the Key Diagram and summarised in Table 1B below. The strategy is to locate new development in the most sustainable locations and the priority is to steer growth primarily to brownfield land in urban areas of Bath, Keynsham and the larger settlements in the Somer Valley. However, in order to meet the housing requirement and facilitate economic growth in accordance with the objectives of the Core Strategy, some greenfield land is also required, including some sites to be released from the Green Belt because these are the most sustainable locations. The identification of land for development has sought to minimise the impact on the environment and the harm to the Green Belt, as well as taking account of infrastructure requirements. The Council has therefore sought to make provision for the level of development likely to be needed. The broad spatial principles are summarised below and elaborated in the place-based chapters 2-5.</p> <p><b><u>Table 1B – spatial distribution of the housing requirement</u></b></p>	



Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications						
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change			SA screening
				<b>Total housing</b>	<i>Actual supply figures in November 2013 SHLAA trajectory have been rounded to the nearest 10</i>	
			Bath	7,020		
			Keynsham	2,150		
			Somer Valley	2,470		
			Rural Areas	1,120		
			Whitchurch Green Belt	200		
			Total	12,960		
<b>MM9</b>	CSA7 (SPC15) Amendments made	Para 1.27 (page 19)	<p><b>Bath, as is the District's</b> the economic driver in the district is the primary focus for new development. It is also an important sub-regional economic centre. The spatial strategy begins to address the existing commuting imbalance (not in commuting) by directing more homes than jobs to the city. However Significant provision is made within Bath for economic growth, particularly modern employment space to meet the changing needs of the economy and take advantage of Bath's competitive position. The Council's policy of 'smart' growth promotes higher value sectors rather than only volume growth. Key areas of change within the city are along the riverside, especially in the western corridor, in the Enterprise Area. <b>In order to meet development needs, land also needs to be released from the Green Belt. The Council has undertaken a careful assessment of the options and has identified a location which causes the least harm to the City's highly sensitive environment and has sought to minimise scale of the impact. Land is therefore released from the Green Belt at Odd Down and allocated for development.</b></p>			Reference to Weston removed from last sentence.

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
				Change needs to be reflected in the SA
MM10	CSA8 (SPC16) Amendments made	Para 1.28 (page 19)	<b>Keynsham</b> currently has a balance between numbers of resident workers and jobs but experiences significant in and out-commuting in light of the mismatch of resident workforce and available jobs. <u>Although the homes/jobs provision for Keynsham is roughly equal, the A</u> focus will be to generate a range of jobs more suitable to the resident workforce. The key areas of change in Keynsham will be in the town centre and at Somerdale which has significant implications for the future of the town. <u>In addition land is removed from the Green Belt to the south west and east of the town and allocated for development in order to provide additional employment floor space and housing. However, infrastructure constraints and national Green Belt objectives limit the level of development that the Town can accommodate. Land is also removed from the Green Belt at East Keynsham and safeguarded for possible development in the future. Development of this land will be permitted only when allocated for development following a review of the plan.</u> These changes <u>do not undermine</u> the Core Strategy objective <del>seeks</del> to maintain the town's separate identity.	Clarification  Clarification  No implications for final SA.
MM12	CSA9 (SPC18) Amendme	Para 1.30A	<u>However, in order to meet development needs during the Plan period, land is released from the Green Belt and allocated for development at Whitchurch. Whilst not well placed for Bath, the Council's sustainability appraisal identifies land on the edge of Bristol as being a relatively</u>	

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
	nts made		<p>sustainable location.</p> <p><i>Deletion of last sentence:</i></p> <p>The scope for development is limited in light of the environmental assets in the area and the infrastructure constraints. The Council will need to work closely with Bristol to ensure the development relates well to Bristol and does not prejudice regeneration proposals for south Bristol.</p>	<p>Not included in Schedule of Additional Mods.</p> <p>The Policy RA5 sets out the requirements for ensuring that the development of the site at Whitchurch is well connected with Whitchurch village and with south Bristol. No implications for the SA.</p>
MM13	CSA10 (SPC19, RC3) Amendments made	Para 1.31 (page 19)	<p>The <b>Green Belt</b> is shown on the Key Diagram. <del>No changes are proposed to the general extent of the Green Belt, in the form of either extensions or deletions.</del> The development of the spatial strategy has sought to minimise the impact on the Green Belt as far as possible. However, as described above, <b>four</b> strategic changes are made to the inner Green Belt boundary to release land to meet the need for new development. The new detailed boundary is set out on the Policies Map.</p>	<p>Reference to the deletion of Weston. Change needs to be reflected in the SA.</p>

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications																																										
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening																																						
MM14a	-	New Diagram	<p><b>Housing Trajectory as at adoption</b></p> <table border="1"> <caption>Housing Trajectory as at adoption</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Completions</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>11/12</td><td>463</td></tr> <tr><td>12/13</td><td>550</td></tr> <tr><td>13/14</td><td>510</td></tr> <tr><td>14/15</td><td>850</td></tr> <tr><td>15/16</td><td>850</td></tr> <tr><td>16/17</td><td>850</td></tr> <tr><td>17/18</td><td>850</td></tr> <tr><td>18/19</td><td>850</td></tr> <tr><td>19/20</td><td>722</td></tr> <tr><td>20/21</td><td>722</td></tr> <tr><td>21/22</td><td>722</td></tr> <tr><td>22/23</td><td>722</td></tr> <tr><td>23/24</td><td>722</td></tr> <tr><td>24/25</td><td>722</td></tr> <tr><td>25/26</td><td>722</td></tr> <tr><td>26/27</td><td>722</td></tr> <tr><td>27/28</td><td>722</td></tr> <tr><td>28/29</td><td>722</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Note: completions for 2013/14 are those subsequent are provisional pending the completion of full year monitoring.</i></p>	Year	Completions	11/12	463	12/13	550	13/14	510	14/15	850	15/16	850	16/17	850	17/18	850	18/19	850	19/20	722	20/21	722	21/22	722	22/23	722	23/24	722	24/25	722	25/26	722	26/27	722	27/28	722	28/29	722	<p>New table included for information. Discussed at the hearings change made in order to provide greater clarity regarding housing delivery trajectory.</p> <p>No implications for the SA.</p>
Year	Completions																																									
11/12	463																																									
12/13	550																																									
13/14	510																																									
14/15	850																																									
15/16	850																																									
16/17	850																																									
17/18	850																																									
18/19	850																																									
19/20	722																																									
20/21	722																																									
21/22	722																																									
22/23	722																																									
23/24	722																																									
24/25	722																																									
25/26	722																																									
26/27	722																																									
27/28	722																																									
28/29	722																																									
MM16	CSA13 (SPC22) Amendments made	Para 1.36 (page 20)	<p><b>Delete para 1.36</b></p> <p><b>Contingency:</b> 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</p>	<p>Inspector did not consider the reference was necessary as it does not amount to contingency</p>																																						

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
			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 programmed for around 2016.	rather it provides for some limited flexibility in the Plan. No implications for the SA.
<b>MM17</b>	CSA14	Policy DW1 (page 20)	<p><b>POLICY DW1 District-wide spatial Strategy</b></p> <p>The overarching strategy for B&amp;NES is to promote sustainable development by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1: focussing new housing, jobs and community facilities in Bath, Keynsham, <del>Midsomer Norton and Radstock</del> and <u>the Somer Valley</u> particularly ensuring: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a: there is the necessary modern office space in <b>Bath</b> within or adjoining the city centre to enable diversification of the economy whilst maintaining the unique heritage of the City</li> <li>b: sufficient space is available in <b>Keynsham</b> to reposition the town as a more significant business location whilst retaining its separate identity</li> <li>c: there is deliverable space to enable job growth in the towns and principal villages in the <b>Somer Valley</b> to create a thriving and vibrant area which is more self-reliant socially and economically</li> <li>d: development in <b>rural areas</b> is located at settlements with a good range of local facilities and with good access to public transport</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
	(SPC23, RC6)		<p>2: making provision <del>to for</del> <u>accommodate</u>;</p> <p>a. a net increase of <del>40,170</del> <u>10,300</u> jobs;</p> <p>b. <del>an increase in the supply of housing by around 13,000 homes, between (2006 and 2026), of which around 3,400 affordable homes will be delivered through the planning system.</del></p>	
	BNES/56		<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 within B&amp;NES, <u>other than removing land meet the District's development needs at the following locations identified on the Key Diagram and allocated on the Policies Map:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Land adjoining Odd Down</u></li> <li>• <u>Land adjoining East Keynsham</u></li> <li>• <u>Land adjoining South West Keynsham</u></li> <li>• <u>Land at Whitchurch</u></li> </ul>	Land at Weston deleted from this list
	(SPC24 (RC7)		<p>5: requiring development to be designed in a way that is resilient to the impacts of climate change</p> <p>6: <u>protecting, conserving and enhancing the district's nationally and locally important cultural and historic assets</u></p> <p>7: protecting and enhancing the district's biodiversity resource including sites, habitats and species of European importance</p>	Change needs to be reflected in the SA.
	<u>Amendment made</u>			

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications						
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change			SA screening
	SPC25 (RC5)  SPC26 (SPC27, RC9)		<p>8: ensuring infrastructure is aligned with new development</p> <p><del>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.</del></p> <p>9. <u>Reviewing the Core Strategy at around five yearly intervals and when necessary, make changes to ensure that both:</u></p> <p>a. <u>the objectives are being achieved, particularly the delivery of the housing and work space targets set out in Table 9 to ensure that there remains a flexible supply of deliverable and developable land; and</u></p> <p>b. <u>the Core Strategy is planning for the most appropriate growth targets, particularly housing and work space /jobs.</u></p> <p><u>The first review will be timed to co-ordinate with the review of the West of England Core Strategies in around 2016.</u></p>			
MM18	CSA15  <b>Amendment made</b>	Table 1 (Page 20)	<b>Locational Policies</b>	<b>Core Strategy Policy</b>		Reference to Policy B3B (Weston) deleted from table
			The Policy Framework for the location of new development is as follows:			
			Bath	Policies B1, B2, B3, B3A, B3C, B4		
			Keynsham	Policies KE1, KE2, KE3A & B, KE4		
Midsomer Norton, Westfield & Radstock	Policies SV1, SV2, SV3					

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications						
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change			SA screening
			Paulton, Peasedown St. John, Timsbury, Camerton, Hallatrow, High Littleton, Farrington Gurney	Policy SV1, and RA1 or RA2		No implications for final SA.
			Bathampton, Batheaston, Bathford, Bishop Sutton, Clutton/Temple Cloud, Compton Martin, East Harptree, Farrington Gurney, Farmborough, Hinton Blewett, Saltford, Camerton, Ubley, West Harptree and Whitchurch	Policy RA1 or RA2		
			<u>Whitchurch</u>	<u>Policy RA5</u>		
<b>MM21</b>	SPC46 Part only	Vision for Bath (page 32) <b>4<sup>th</sup> para only</b>	<p><b>The Vision</b></p> <p>Delete 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph and insert:</p> <p><u>The need for more housing will enable the regeneration of many areas within the city. Where development is needed on the edge of Bath it will be positioned, master planned and designed to sustain the 'significance' of Bath's heritage assets and the integrity of its landscape setting. Parallel investment in public transport infrastructure and walking and cycling routes will keep the city moving and enable more sustainable travel choices to be made.</u></p>			<p>Wording of the 4<sup>th</sup> para doesn't differ from that appraised as part of SPC46.</p> <p>Remaining changes to the Bath Vision included in the Schedule of</p>



Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
				Additional Mods (MM21). No implications for final SA.
MM22	CSA17 (SPC47, PC15 as amended)  SPC48 (PC15, SPC49)  SPC50 (RC17)  Amendment made	Diagram 5 (page 33)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicate the strategic site location at Odd Down, Bath</li> <li>Delete notation and label for East of Bath Park &amp; Ride</li> <li>Add Combe Hay</li> <li>Change notation of Bath Spa University so that it is the same as The University of Bath (i.e. white dotted circle rather than black).</li> <li>Bath's Neighbourhoods label to be amended to reflect revised policy wording.</li> <li>Amend the area of search for location of flood storage facility to extend westwards following the line of the river.</li> <li>Amend Central Area boundary so that it follows the riverside walk along the eastern riverside walk (outer bend) of the River Avon (between North Parade and Pulteney Bridge, rather than encompassing the Recreation Ground/North Parade Road.</li> </ul> <p>(see Annex to Schedule,)</p>	Reference to Weston deleted. No implications for final SA - mapping issue
MM23		Policy B1 (page 34)	<p><b>POLICY B1: Bath Spatial Strategy</b></p> <p>The strategy for Bath is to:</p>	

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
	SPC51 (RC13)		<p><b>1. Natural and Built Environment</b></p> <p>a: <del>_____</del> <u>Protect, conserve, and where possible, Sustain and enhance the significance of the city's heritage assets, including:</u></p> <p>a: <del>_____</del> The Outstanding Universal Value of the <u>City of Bath World Heritage Site</u> and its setting <del>including that part which is designated as Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</del></p> <p>b: Listed buildings, the <u>Bath</u> conservation area and their settings.</p> <p>c: Archaeology, scheduled ancient monuments, <u>and</u> historic parks and gardens.</p> <p>d: Non-designated heritage assets of local interest and value.</p> <p>b: <u>Give great weight to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</u></p> <p>e: <del>c:</del> <u>The network of green spaces and wildlife corridors including the River Avon and Kennet and Avon Canal, Local Nature Reserves, formal and informal parks and recreational areas, trees and woodlands.</u></p> <p>f: <del>d:</del> <u>The biodiversity resource including species and habitats of European importance.</u></p> <p><u>All of the following objectives will be considered in the context of part 1 of this policy:</u></p>	
	SPC52 (RC14)			
	SPC53 (PC17)		<p><b>2. Economic Development</b></p> <p>a: Plan for an overall net increase in jobs <del>from of about 7,000, rising from 61,700</del> <u>60,200 in 2006 2011 to 67,400 67,200 in 2026 2029</u>, with significant gains in business services tempered by losses in defence and manufacturing.</p>	

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
	CSA18 (SPC54, RC15)		<p>b: Plan for the expansion of knowledge intensive and creative employment <u>sectors</u> by enabling the stock of office premises to increase from about <del>240,000m<sup>2</sup></del> <u>173,000 m<sup>2</sup></u> in <del>2006</del> <u>2011</u> to about <del>340,000m<sup>2</sup></del> <u>213,000m<sup>2</sup></u> in <del>2026</del> <u>2029</u>.</p> <p>c: Achieve the net additional increase to the stock of office premises of <u>40,000 m<sup>2</sup></u> by enabling the development of <del>85,000-100,000m<sup>2</sup></del> <u>50,000 m<sup>2</sup></u> of new space, linked to a managed release of <del>15,000-30,000m<sup>2</sup></del> <u>10,000m<sup>2</sup></u> of that which is qualitatively least suitable for continued occupation.</p> <p>d: Focus new office development within and adjoining the city centre <u>and enable appropriate levels of business space in mixed use out-of-centre development sites.</u></p> <p>e: Plan for a contraction in the demand of industrial floor space from about <del>240,000m<sup>2</sup></del> <u>167,000m<sup>2</sup></u> in <del>2006</del> <u>2011</u> to about <del>240,000m<sup>2</sup></del> <u>127,000m<sup>2</sup></u> in <del>2026</del> <u>2029</u> but sustain a mixed economy to support Bath's multi-skilled workforce and multi-faceted economic base by retaining <u>a presumption of favour of industrial land in the Newbridge Riverside area.</u></p> <p><b>3. Housing</b></p> <p>(a) Enable the development of about <del>6,000</del> <del>,7000</del> <u>7,020</u> new homes <del>within the city</del>, increasing the overall stock of housing from 40,000 to <del>46,000</del> <u>47,000</u>. <u>The following distribution of housing will be planned for:</u></p> <p><u>Large sites in the Central Area and Enterprise Area – 3,300</u></p> <p><u>Large sites in the outer neighbourhoods, including former MoD land and the extension to MoD, Ensleigh 2,100</u></p> <p><u>Small scale intensification distributed throughout the existing urban area -1,150</u></p>	Reference to Weston deleted from this list. Change needs

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
	Amendment made		<p><u>Land adjoining Odd Down – 300</u></p> <p><del>b. Of these new homes about 3,500 will be delivered within the Central Area and Western Corridor, focused on 'Western Riverside' and about 2,800 homes will come forward within Bath's outer neighbourhoods where surplus Ministry of Defence land will play a major role alongside smaller scale suburban infilling and redevelopment.</del></p> <p><b>4. The Relationship between Population, Labour Supply and Employment</b></p> <p>a: <u>At the margin of delivery, Achieve</u> a better balance between the overall number of jobs in the city and the resident workforce. <del>At</del> <u>A sufficient</u> increase in housing delivery and the associated growth of the labour force will reduce the need for labour to be imported from neighbouring locations. Economic diversification will reduce the need for a significant minority of resident workers to out-commute to other areas.</p> <p>b: Reduce the proportion of the resident workforce who out commute and enable a shift in the level of self-containment from 70% to nearer 80%.</p> <p><b>5. Previously developed land</b></p> <p>a: Regenerate and repair a number of areas within the Central Area and <del>Western Corridor</del> <u>Enterprise Area</u> to create new areas of attractive and productive townscape and a much improved relationship between the city and its river.</p> <p>b: Transform the Western Riverside area into a contemporary residential neighbourhood</p> <p>c: Redevelop surplus Ministry of Defence land at Foxhill, Warminster Road and <del>potentially</del> <u>Enleigh</u> to optimise the contribution that these areas can make to the city's development needs.</p>	to be reflected in the SA.

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
			<p><b>6. Shopping</b></p> <p>a: Ensure that the primary shopping area successfully absorbs Southgate into the trading patterns and character of the city centre by not making provision for a further large scale comparison retail project</p> <p>b: Enable small to medium sized comparison retail development that improves the shopping offer and enhances the reputation of the city centre.</p> <p>c: Protect and where possible enhance the vitality and viability of district and local centres.</p> <p>d: Focus additional convenience retail floorspace (beyond existing commitments) within and on the edge of existing centres before considering out-of-centre sites that might improve the spatial pattern of provision across the city.</p> <p>e: <u>enable the provision of neighbourhood retail services at Ensleigh, Warminster Road, Foxhill, and at Odd Down Green Belt.</u></p> <p><b>7. Higher Education</b></p> <p>a: Enable the provision for additional on-campus student bed spaces <u>at the University of Bath and at Bath Spa University</u>, facilitating growth in the overall number of students <u>and shrinkage but avoiding growth</u> of the private student lettings market.</p> <p>b: Enable provision of additional on campus and in-city teaching and research space.</p> <p><b>8. Tourism, Culture and Sport</b></p> <p>a: Manage the provision of 500-750 new hotel bedrooms to widen the accommodation offer for the city, increase overnight stays and the competitiveness of the Bath as a visitor and business</p>	Clarification.

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
	Amendment made  Amendment made	SPC55 (RC16, PC19)	<p>destination.</p> <p>b: <del>Enable the development of a new stadium and associated uses within the Central Area. At the Recreation Ground, and subject to the resolution of any unique legal issues and constraints, enable the development of a sporting, cultural and leisure stadium.</del></p> <p>c: Enable the provision of enhanced facilities for interpretation of the World Heritage Site in the Central Area and for the City's Archives</p> <p>d: Enable the provision for a new cultural/ performance/arts venue within the Central Area.</p> <p><b>9. Public Realm</b></p> <p>a: Facilitate enhancement of the public realm of the Central Area and delivery of a Wayfinding and City Information System in line with the Public Realm and Movement Strategy.</p> <p><b>10. Infrastructure and Delivery</b></p> <p>To enable the delivery of the spatial strategy for Bath it will be necessary to implement the actions presented in Section 2G. In summary this means:</p> <p>a: Implementing improvements to walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure, including the 'Bath Package', to improve connectivity to and from areas of housing, employment and neighbourhood centres.</p> <p>b: Implementing a new Parking Strategy.</p> <p>c: Implementing the Air Quality Management Plan for Bath.</p> <p>d: <del>Implementing an upstream flood storage facility</del> <u>flood mitigation measures</u> to ensure <del>enable</del> development in vulnerable areas of the Central Area and <del>Western Corridor</del> <u>Enterprise Area is safe</u></p>	

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
	SPC56 (PC20)		<p><u>whilst not increasing risk elsewhere.</u></p> <p>e: Addressing land remediation within the Central Area and Western Corridor in relation to industrial and utilities uses. The decommissioning and removal of the Windsor Gas Holder Station must be addressed as part of the redevelopment of Bath Western Riverside and its environs.</p> <p><b>11. Energy conservation and sustainable energy generation</b></p> <p>a: Enable renewable energy generation including the development of district heating networks.</p> <p>b: Improve the energy efficiency of the built environment.</p>	
MM28		Policy B2 (page 39) (part only)	<b>3. Key Development Opportunities</b>	Only the changes to this part of Policy B2 are considered

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
	SPC67 (RC19, PC26 as amended)		<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 <del>PPS4</del> the NPPE, economic development led 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><i>City Centre</i></p> <p>a: North of Pulteney Bridge (Cornmarket, Cattlemarket, Hilton Hotel, and The Podium)</p> <p>b: Manvers Street Car Park, Avon &amp; Somerset Police Station and Royal Mail Depot area</p> <p>c: Green Park Road (Green Park House)</p> <p>d: Bath Quays North (Avon Street Car and Coach Park and City College)</p> <p>e: Kingsmead (Kingsmead House, Telephone Exchange, Plymouth House and land in the vicinity of Kingsmead Square)</p> <p><i>Neighbouring the City Centre</i></p> <p><del>f: The Recreation Ground and Leisure Centre</del></p> <p>g: Bath Quays South (Stothert and Pitt to Travis Perkins)</p> <p>h: The Green Park Station area</p> <p>i: The Homebase area including the Pinesway industrial estate and gyratory.</p> <p><b>4. Scope and Scale of Change</b></p> <p><i>The key activities to be accommodated within the Central Area are:</i></p> <p>a: Small to medium sized comparison retail development where this retains a compact and</p>	<p>by the Inspector necessary for soundness. The remainder of Policy B2 included in the Schedule of Minor Mods (MM28). Appraised in March 2013 - no change.</p>
	SPC67			



Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
	SPC68  SPC69/ SPC69A (RC20, PC28)		<p>continuous primary shopping area</p> <p>b: <del>75,000-100,000</del> <u>A net increase of about 40,000</u> sq.m of modern office floorspace and creative workspace, to enable the growth of sectors targeted in the Economic Strategy</p> <p>c: 2,000 sq.m of convenience shopping space to address the overtrading of existing stores</p> <p>d: Manage the delivery of 500-750 hotel bedrooms to widen the accommodation offer of the city, increase overnight stays and the competitiveness of the city as a popular visitor destination</p> <p>e: About 500 additional dwellings as part of mixed use schemes on the key redevelopment opportunities that have been identified</p> <p>f: A Rejuvenated public transport interchange including improvements to Bath Spa Rail Station</p> <p>g: A Comprehensive programme for public realm enhancement and implementation of a Wayfinding and City Information System</p> <p><del>h: A new sports stadium with associated uses including conferencing and banqueting facilities and active riverside frontage</del></p> <p><u>(h) Existing uses within the Central Area that remain compatible with its future role and the scope and scale of change envisaged for it, should, where appropriate, be reincorporated as part of redevelopment proposals, unless this is not viable or would significantly reduce the capacity of the Central Area to accommodate jobs or housing development. In such circumstances reasonable efforts should be made to ensure such uses are relocated elsewhere.</u></p> <p>i: A cultural / performance / arts venue</p> <p>j: The retention and enhancement of leisure facilities</p> <p>k: Major riverside access and habitat enhancements</p>	
<b>MM31</b>		Policy B3	<b>POLICY B3 Strategic Policy for Twerton and Newbridge Riversides</b>	Only the changes to this

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
	CSA19 (SPC74)	(page 47) (part only)	<p><b>1. Role of Newbridge and Twerton Riversides (including the Bath Press)</b></p> <p><i>Existing text under this heading deleted and insert:</i></p> <p><u>These locations form the western extent of the City of Ideas Enterprise Area</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Newbridge Riverside will function as Bath's primary location for industrial enterprise, providing about 12 ha of land at Locksbrook Road, Brassmill Lane and the Maltings for a range of activities including advanced manufacturing. There is therefore a presumption in favour of retaining land and premises in the B1, B2 and B8 use class where this remains a viable use of land and is supported by market signals that there is demand for continued occupation that cannot reasonably be accommodated elsewhere.</u></li> <li><u>Twerton Riverside has contracted as an industrial location in recent decades. This area is suitable for a broader range of uses and there is scope to redevelop the area to provide new business (B1a, b and c) premises and housing. The area presents an opportunity to host business that is displaced as a consequence of the residential led development of Western Riverside and the growth of the intensification of the Central Area into BWR East. Whilst Newbridge Riverside will remain the core industrial location, Twerton Riverside can provide additional flexibility. It will therefore necessary to maintain an appropriate level of land in this area for B1c uses alongside office uses and housing.</u></li> </ul> <p><b>2. Placemaking Principles</b></p> <p>Assets of Newbridge and Twerton Riverside Development proposals must be informed and shaped by the following characteristics</p> <p><del>a. Newbridge Riverside functions as Bath's primary location for industrial enterprise, providing about 12 hectares of land at Locksbrook Road, Brassmill Lane and the Maltings for a range of activities including advanced manufacturing.</del></p> <p><del>b. There is a strong relationship between the industries and occupations at Newbridge Riverside and the skills and labour prevalent in surrounding neighbourhoods.</del></p>	<p>part of Policy B3 are considered by the Inspector necessary for soundness. The remainder of Policy B3 included in the Schedule of Minor Mods (MM31).</p> <p>Appraised in March 2013 - no change.</p>

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
	<p>Amendme nt made</p> <p>Amendme nt made</p> <p>SPC75 (RC21, PC33)</p>		<p><del>C a.</del> The eastern part of Twerton Riverside lies in <del>close proximity</del> lies close to the Western Riverside Policy Area which will experience a significant uplift in its environmental quality and will act as a catalyst for investment in the wider area. <del>Western Riverside will experience a significant uplift in its environmental quality during the lifetime of the Core Strategy.</del></p> <p><i>Remaining Placemaking Principles not necessary for soundness.</i></p> <p><i>3 Key Development Opportunities not necessary for soundness</i></p> <p><b>4. Scope and Scale of Change</b> <i>Previous text deleted</i></p>	

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
MM34		Para 2.26B	Not needed for soundness (Twerton Park)	New para 2.26B included in the Schedule of Additional Mods. No implication for SA. This change was considered in 2013 screening of proposed changes.
MM35		Diagram 10	Not needed for soundness (Twerton Park)	Notation for Twerton Park removed from diagrams  No implications for SA
MM37	CSA20 (SPC87)  Amendment made	Para 2.30A	<b>Development on the edge of Bath</b>  <u>In order to meet the need for additional housing within the District during the Plan period development needs to take place at two locations on the edge of Bath: on land adjoining Odd Down and MoD, Ensleigh, Lansdown. At Odd Down, land is removed from the Green Belt. Policy B3A allocates land here for residential led development and a revised detailed Green Belt boundary is defined. Policy B3A also outlines the place-making principles to be met in delivering the</u>	Reference to Weston removed.  Change needs to be reflected in the SA..

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
			<u>development. The place-making principles are illustrated on a concept diagram for the site.</u>	
MM38	CSA21 (SPC87) Amendment made	Para 2.30B	<u>National planning policy makes it clear that when altering Green Belt boundaries a long term view needs to be taken to ensure that boundaries endure beyond the plan period. Where necessary this can include plans identifying areas of safeguarded land to meet longer term development needs. At Odd Down environmental sensitivity and the need to minimise harm means that there is no scope to identify safeguarded land for the longer term.</u>	Reference to Weston removed.  Change needs to be reflected in the SA..
MM39	CSA22 (SPC88)  Amendments made	Policy B3A	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Land adjoining Odd Down, Bath Strategic Site Allocation</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Policy B3A</u></b></p> <p><u>Land is removed from the Green Belt as shown on the <i>Key Diagram and Policies Map</i> and allocated for residential development and associated infrastructure during the Plan period.</u></p> <p><u>The requirements that need to be met to enable development are set out in the Placemaking Principles, Core Policies and indicated on the <i>Concept Diagram</i>. The Placemaking Principles, being site specific, take priority over the Core Policies.</u></p> <p><b><u>Placemaking Principles:</u></b></p> <p><b>1.</b> Residential led mixed use development (to include 40% affordable housing) of around <b>300 dwellings</b>, in the plan period. The site should be developed at an average density of 35-40dph. <b>The figure of 300 dwellings is not a cap on development if all the</b></p>	No implications for the SA. Increasing the number of homes developed on this site might be beneficial for sustainability with regards to the delivery of new homes and the Placemaking Principles will ensure that any

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
			<p><u>placemaking principles can be met</u></p> <p>2. <u>Preparation of a comprehensive <b>Masterplan</b>, through public consultation, reflecting best practice as embodied in 'By Design' (or successor guidance), ensuring that it is well integrated with neighbouring areas.</u></p> <p>3. <u>Provision of <b>Green infrastructure</b> including multifunctional green space (formal, natural and allotments); well integrated Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems and habitat, pedestrian and cycle connectivity within the site and to the surrounding area.</u></p> <p>4. <u>Include new <b>Public Rights of Way</b> and provide enhanced public access within the site and connecting well to the surrounding area.</u></p> <p>5. <u>A <b>Landscape and Ecological Mitigation Strategy and Management Plan</b> is required, as part of the Masterplan, to ensure satisfactory mitigation and protection to include:</u></p> <p><u><i>Ecological Requirements</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Protection of dark skies to the south and east of the location including zones of no artificial light adjacent to the protected tree belt and other ecological features retained or created within the site and in adjacent grazing lands. Light spill should be limited to no more than 1 lux (equivalent to a moonlit night)</u></li> <li>• <u>Retention and cultivation of planting features and off-site habitat including the retention of hedgerows and tree belts, as indicated on the <i>Concept Diagram</i></u></li> <li>• <u>Safeguard skylark interest, through adequate mitigation or off-site compensation</u></li> <li>• <u>New woodland planting along the southern boundary of the plateau, particularly to the east of Sulis Manor (i) within the site and (ii) off-site within the plateau in order to strengthen bat foraging and flight links with Horsecombe Vale</u></li> <li>• <u>A recreational strategy to minimise harm to adjacent grazing regimes and habitats</u></li> </ul>	potential effects of developing more homes are mitigated.

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
			<p><u>Particular attention is to be given to ensure satisfactory mitigation and or compensation as appropriate of protected species and their habitat (including Priority Species).</u></p> <p><u>Landscape Requirements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Retention and protection of existing trees and significant hedgerows by inclusion within public open space and enhance hedgerows by provision of additional planting</u></li> <li>• <u>Protect the tree belt on the southern edge of the site and enhance with additional planting to ensure visual screening of the site from views to the south</u></li> <li>• <u>Avoid or minimise detrimental impacts on (and provide enhancements to important landscape features and significant views):</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <u>the Cotswolds AONB</u></li> <li>○ <u>South Stoke Conservation area and its setting</u></li> <li>○ <u>The character of the Cam Brook valley and Sulis Manor Plateau</u></li> <li>○ <u>The character of South Stoke and Combe Hay Lanes</u></li> <li>○ <u>Midford Road and the Cross Keys junction including maintaining open rural views over the plateau</u></li> <li>○ <u>The Wansdyke Scheduled Monument</u></li> <li>○ <u>Medium and long distance views such as Upper Twinhoe and Baggridge Hill.</u></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><u>6. Seek to conserve the significance of heritage assets. As part of the Masterplan the following should be addressed:</u></p> <p><u>World Heritage Site</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>The Southern boundary of the site should remain undeveloped to limit the visibility of development in wider views. An acceptable southerly extent of development and appropriate building heights will need to be established as part of the Masterplan.</u></li> <li>• <u>The Easterly extent of development and appropriate Eastern boundary treatment should be established as part of the Masterplan.</u></li> <li>• <u>Control light pollution to protect the visual screening of the site from views to the</u></li> </ul>	

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
			<p>south.</p> <p><u>Wansdyke Scheduled Monument</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within the allocation, avoid built development in the field immediately to the south of the Wansdyke. To mitigate impacts, tree planting should be retained as indicated on the <i>Concept Diagram</i>.</li> <li>• A Management Plan setting out a strategy for the long-term and effective management of the monument including detailed measures for its positive enhancement will be developed in consultation with English Heritage and form part of any development proposals. This should include a recreational and movement solution which serves the new community and minimises harm to the Scheduled Monument.</li> <li>• Limit development height and density in more prominent areas, such as higher ground and development edges. in order to avoid the development breaking the skyline in views from the Wansdyke.</li> <li>• Limit lighting column heights to that of the development to minimise vertical features within the view from the Wansdyke.</li> </ul> <p><u>South Stoke Conservation Area</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit the height and/or density of development closest to South Stoke Conservation Area to avoid harm to its setting.</li> </ul> <p><u>Sulis Manor</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporate Sulis Manor and garden into development sensitively, retaining the framework of trees, and considering the conversion/retention of the Manor House and/or a low density development</li> </ul> <p>7. <u>In relation to transport, the following apply:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide vehicular access, and junction enhancement, to facilitate access to the site from Combe Hay Lane.</li> <li>• Provide an additional access for emergency vehicles.</li> <li>• Provide pedestrian and cycle links with Sulis Meadows Estate and Sulis</li> </ul>	Not a significant change.





Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
			12. <u>Localised areas of <b>land instability</b> must be either avoided or addressed with appropriate remediation.</u>	appraisal and amend to reflect this change.
MM42	CSA25	Policy B3B	Not required for soundness	Deletion of Weston Strategic Allocation.  Change needs to be reflected in the SA.
MM43	CSA26	Concept Diagram 1	Not required for soundness	
MM44	CSA27	Concept Diagram 2	Not required for soundness	
MM45	CSA28	Policies Map	Not required for soundness	
MM46	SPC90  Amendment made	Policy B3C	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Policy B3C Extension to MOD, Ensleigh</u></b></p> <p><u>Land adjoining Ensleigh MOD site as shown on the Key Diagram is identified for the development of 120 dwellings during the Plan period. The Placemaking Plan will allocate a site for comprehensive residential led mixed use development comprising the Ensleigh MOD site and the land adjoining it. The planning requirements relating to the land adjoining the Ensleigh MOD site are set out in the Concept Statement for the Ensleigh MOD site below.</u></p> <p><u>Planning requirements for land adjoining Ensleigh MOD site:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>Residential led mixed use development of around 120 dwellings in the plan period.</u></li> <li>b. <u>Be developed to a comprehensive Masterplan for the wider Ensleigh MOD site. The wider site should be more self-contained with its own local facilities. Development</u></li> </ol>	Clarification No implications for final SA.

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
			<p><u>should reflect best practice as embodied in 'By Design' (or successor guidance) ensuring that it is well integrated with neighbouring areas.</u></p> <p>c. <u>Development phasing should start with the current MoD Ensleigh site.</u></p> <p>d. <u>Ensure that the principles and benefits of Green Infrastructure contained in the Green Infrastructure Strategy and other guidance and best practice are embedded in the design and development process from an early stage. Key requirements include provision of habitat connectivity through the retention and enhancement of the existing high valued habitat; provision of well integrated green space (formal, natural and allotments); provision of well integrated Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems; and provision of cycle and pedestrian links through the site connecting to the existing network particularly towards Bath city centre and Weston and Larkhall local centres.</u></p> <p>e. <u>Appropriate site assessment and ecological surveys to be undertaken to inform site master planning with particular attention to the SNCI and potential impacts to Bradford-upon-Avon bats SAC.</u></p> <p>f. <u>Identify and assess the landscape character, landscape features and significant view points and the likely effects of development on them. Protect and enhance these aspects and mitigate to avoid or minimise the effects. Significant aspects of landscape include the Cotswold AONB; the World Heritage Site and its setting; Bath Conservation Area and its setting; the character of the Lansdown plateau; trees including ancient woodland, tree belts, hedges and field patterns; Lansdown Road and its open rural character; and tranquillity. Significant viewpoints include local properties; Upper Swainswick; Beckford's Tower; Lansdown Road; and local Public Rights of Way.</u></p> <p>g. <u>Assess and evaluate any direct or indirect impacts on designated heritage assets and their visual/landscape settings. Prepare and implement management schemes (including avoidance or physical separation) in order to mitigate the impacts of development and ensure the long-term protection and enhancement of the designated heritage assets and their settings. Designated heritage assets potentially affected by development at this location include Beckford's Tower (Grade I), Ensleigh House and</u></p>	

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
			<p><u>Lansdown Cemetery Gates (Grade II), Bath Conservation Area and Bath World Heritage Site.</u></p> <p>h. <u>Assess and evaluate any impacts on non-designated heritage assets. The degree of harm to or loss of non-designated heritage assets will be balanced against the positive contribution made by the development and the extent to which harm/loss can be mitigated. Non-designated heritage assets of equal significance to designated heritage assets will be subject to the same considerations as designated historic assets. Non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development at this location include Bronze Age barrow cemetery, Roman road and roadside burials, and medieval settlement and chapel.</u></p> <p>i. <u>The assessment and evaluation of the above designated and non-designated heritage assets should also consider their cumulative or collective “group value” and also understand the heritage assets’ relationship to other environmental considerations.</u></p> <p>j. <u>Ensure good public transport provision.</u></p> <p>k. <u>Development should scope potential for and incorporate renewable energy.</u></p> <p>l. <u>Educational needs generated by the development must be met; a primary school is to be provided on the larger site comprising the Ensleigh MOD site and the land adjoining it, unless an alternative solution can be found and agreed with the Education Authority.</u></p> <p>m. <u>Provide integrated waste management infrastructure.</u></p> <p>n. <u>Ensure that displaced playing pitches are re-provided at an appropriate and suitable location.</u></p>	

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
	CSA29 (SPC90)			
MM47	SPC92	Para 2.32	Not needed for soundness (World Heritage Site and its setting)	Para 2.32 included in the Schedule of Additional Mods.  Appraised in March 2013 - no change.
MM48	SPC93	Policy B4	Not needed for soundness (World Heritage Site and its setting)	Policy B4 included in the Schedule of Additional Mods.  Appraised in March 2013 - no change.
MM50	SPC100	Para 2.41	<p><i>Not needed for soundness.</i></p> <p>Growth beyond 2020 will require additional on and off campus capacity to be identified. No alterations to the Green Belt boundary beyond that previously made in the Local Plan are envisaged during the Core Strategy period. <u>However, the nature of exceptional or very special circumstances is that they cannot be predicted and the Council will to consider such circumstances, on their merits, at the time they are presented.</u></p>	Appraised in March 2013 - no change.

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
MM51	SPC102 (RC25, PC51)	Para 2.44 (page 56)	<p>Delete all of para 2.44 and insert:</p> <p><u>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"> <li>• <u>_____ Bath Transport Package – comprising a range of measures including three extended Park &amp; 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></li> <li>• <u>_____ Improvements to the bus network through the Greater Bristol Bus Network major scheme including key routes from Bristol and Midsomer Norton,</u></li> <li>• <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></li> <li>• <u>_____ The West of England authorities (including B&amp;NES) have been awarded Local Sustainable Transport 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 £25.5 million</u></li> <li>• <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></li> <li>• <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. Proposed Change Reason for change through the development of travel plans for new and existing sites and the expansion of car clubs</u></li> </ul>	<p>Text amended from:</p> <p>ii) 'by implementing an experimental weight restriction to remove through HGV traffic (of greater than 18 tonnes) from London Road.'</p> <p>This does not make a difference to the SA.</p>

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
	Amendment made		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>_____ seeking to reduce nitrogen dioxide levels in Bath by, for example, reducing the level of heavy goods vehicle (HGV) traffic in the city through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) the continued support &amp; promotion of the Council's Freight Consolidation Centre for deliveries to central Bath; and</li> <li>ii) by implementing traffic management measures.</li> </ul> </li> <li>_____ Creation of one or more Park &amp; Ride sites on the eastern side of the city to reduce commuter traffic</li> <li>_____ The disused rail line between Brassmill Lane and Windsor Bridge, Bath is safeguarded as a Sustainable Transport route for non-motorised forms of transport (with the exception of mobility scooters). It will provide a high quality and safe cycling and pedestrian route through to Western Riverside that extends the Bristol to Bath Railway path, the Two Tunnels Greenway, and provides a wider choice of sustainable transport routes for local communities to efficiently connect to the city centre and to Bath's Enterprise Area.</li> </ul> <p>_____ The provision of this route will be complementary to the current riverside path. It will help to reduce pressure and potential conflict between cyclists and pedestrians, and enable the riverside to be properly enhanced as an environmental asset and an important part of the city's green infrastructure network. This will help to redefine the image and identity of the Western Corridor as an economically prosperous area that complements the offer of the Central Area, is set within a high quality natural environment, and is accessed by a comprehensive sustainable cycling and pedestrian network.</p>	
MM54	SPC105	Para 2.48 (page 56) Amendment made	<p>Delete para 2.48 and replace with:</p> <p>Following the Flood Risk Management Strategy, the Hydraulic Modelling (Bath Flood Risk Management Project Feb 2013 by B&amp;V) was prepared. The impact of raising the key development sites in the Central Area and the Enterprise Area in Bath is a loss of conveyance, rather than a loss</p>	Very minor change - deletion of 'It confirms that' at the start of the

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
			<u>of flood storage. It recommends, where necessary, to raise all the development sites and the access/egress routes (or raise defence walls) and implement conveyance mitigation measures.</u>	2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence for clarity.  No implications for final SA.
<b>MM56</b>	PC54 as amended	Table 5 (page 57)	<p>IDP Ref</p> <p>Key Infrastructure</p> <p>Phasing</p> <p>Cost</p> <p>Funding and Delivery</p> <p>BI.1</p> <p>Transport Proposals for Bath:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>Rapid Transit Routes</del></li> <li>• New showcase bus corridors</li> <li>• <del>New and e</del> Extended park and ride sites</li> <li>• <u>Upgraded bus stop infrastructure on 9 service routes</u></li> <li>• Safe routes for pedestrians and cyclists</li> <li>• Other essential transport links and improvements</li> </ul> <p>2011-16</p> <p><del>£50.1m</del> <u>£31.85m</u></p>	Factual update  No implications for final SA.



Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
	Amendment made	SPC107	<p><del>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.</del></p> <p>IDP Ref: BI.2                      Key Infrastructure: Improvements to Flood Defences of Bath City Centre and Riverside                      Phasing: 2010-26-29                      Cost: £7.6m Not quantified                      Funding and Delivery: Flood Risk Management Strategy – on-going work between B&amp;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>BI.3                      Public Investment into Bath Western Riverside                      2010-15                      £27.6m                      Homes and Communities Agency Funding through the West of England Single Conversation: West of England Delivery and Infrastructure Plan.</p> <p>BI.4                      Improvements to Bath Train Station and Enhanced Service Frequency from Bath and Oldfield Park to Bristol</p>	

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
			<p>2017-2020</p> <p>£19.7m for Greater Bristol Metro Rail Project</p> <p>Network Rail with Bath &amp; 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 through its Memorandum of Understanding with the Rail industry.</p>	
MM61	SPC114	Policy KE1 (page 64)	<p><b>Policy KE1 The Strategy for Keynsham is to:</b></p> <p><b>1. Natural and Built Environment</b></p> <p>a: Maintain the Green Belt surrounding Keynsham, <u>allowing releases of Green Belt land to the east and south west of Keynsham to accommodate employment and housing growth.</u></p> <p>b: Make better use of the existing green and blue infrastructure (for example parks and rivers) running through and surrounding the town which will be enhanced, made more accessible and linked up.</p> <p><b>2. Housing</b></p> <p>a: Make provision for around <del>4,500</del> <u>2,100</u> new homes (net) between <del>2006 and 2026</del> <u>2011 and 2029</u>. This will include affordable housing, and an appropriate housing mix giving more choice of housing to meet the needs of the local community.</p> <p>b: Allow for residential development if it is within the housing development boundary defined on the proposals map or it forms an element of <del>Policyies</del> <u>Policyies</u> KE2, <u>KE3</u> and <u>KE4</u></p> <p><b>3. Economic Development</b></p>	

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
	Amendment made		<p>a: Plan for about <del>4,500</del> <u>1,600</u> net additional jobs between <del>2006 and 2026</del> <u>2011 and 2029</u></p> <p>b: Make provision for the changes in employment floorspace set out below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Office floorspace: from about <del>20-13,000m2</del> in <del>2006</del> <u>2011</u> to about <del>30,000</del> <u>20,200m2</u> in <del>2026-2029</del></li> <li>Industrial/Warehouse floorspace: <del>no net change by 2026 from level of from</del> about <del>50,000</del> <u>52,000m2</u> in <del>2006</del> <u>2011</u> to <del>75,000 – 80,000</del> <u>60,300m2</u> in 2029 to address future requirements arising in Keynsham and Bath</li> </ul> <p>c: Enable development which supports the town to continue to function as an independent market town. The scale and mix of development will increase self-containment and help develop the town as a more significant business location.</p> <p>d: Retain and extend the Broadmead/Ashmead/Pixash Industrial Estate as an area for business activity (<u>including</u> use classes B1, B2 and B8) complementing the role of the town centre and enable its intensification through higher density business development</p> <p><b>4. Shopping</b></p> <p>a: Provide larger retail units in the town centre to attract a more varied mix of retailers,</p> <p>b: Retain and encourage enhancement of Queen Road and Chandag Road as local centres to complement the town centre because they provide an important range of essential day-to-day goods and services for their local neighbourhoods.</p> <p><b>5. Transport, cycling and walking</b></p> <p>a: Provide for improvements to public transport and enhance connectivity between walking, cycling and public transport routes. (Transport infrastructure measures are set out in the 'Infrastructure and Delivery' section <del>on page 72</del>)</p>	Clarification. No implications for final SA.

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
			<p>b: Implement a reviewed Parking Strategy.</p> <p><b>6. Energy conservation and sustainable energy generation</b></p> <p>a: Enable renewable energy generation opportunities including a new district heating network within Keynsham, potentially anchored by the Centre/Town Hall redevelopment.</p>	
MM63	SCP116	Para 3.19(a)	<p><b>Not needed for soundness (conservation areas in Keynsham)</b></p> <p><del>‘English Heritage currently considers The historic characteristics of the town centre Conservation Area to be are currently undermined ‘at risk’ due to by unsympathetic post-war development, resulting in damage to the historic grain and character, loss of traditional shop fronts and loss of small building frontages and is therefore on the national Heritage at Risk Register.’ Also at risk is the Dapps Hill Conservation Area, which is described on the Register as being in a poor condition and deteriorating.</del></p>	<p>Para 3.19(a) included in the Schedule of Additional Mods.</p> <p>Appraised in March 2013 - no change</p>
MM66	CSA33 (SPC119) Amendments made	Policy KE3A	<p><b><u>Land adjoining East Keynsham</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Strategic Site Allocation</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Policy KE3A</u></b></p> <p><u>Land is removed from the Green Belt as shown on the Key Diagram and Policies Map in order to provide for residential and employment development with associated infrastructure.</u></p> <p><u>The requirements that need to be met to enable development are set out in the Placemaking Principles, Core Policies and indicated on the Concept Diagram. The Placemaking Principles, being site specific, take priority over the Core Policies.</u></p>	Not significant.

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
			<p><b><u>Placemaking Principles:</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Residential development (to include 30% affordable housing) of around around 250 220 - 250 dwellings in the plan period south of the A4 as shown on the concept diagram. Density should vary across the site with the higher densities closest to the A4.</u></li> <li>2. <u>Around 30,000sqm of employment floorspace within Use Classes B1 (b) &amp; (c), B2 and any employment use not falling within the NPPF definition of a main town centre use, north of the A4 as shown on the concept diagram.</u></li> <li>3. <u>Preparation of a comprehensive Masterplan, through public consultation, and agreed by the Council, reflecting best practice as embodied in 'By Design' (or successor guidance), ensuring that development is well integrated with neighbouring areas.</u></li> <li>4. <u>Dwellings should front onto the A4 and have a positive relationship with all publically accessible routes. Development should face outwards towards the open countryside, adopting a perimeter block layout, with a clear distinction between the fronts and backs of properties.</u></li> <li>5. <u>Employment / industrial buildings should have a positive frontage onto the A4 and all publically accessible routes, and seek to avoid creating a corridor of parking and yards along the roadside.</u></li> <li>6. <u>Development should incorporate an element of traditional materials, including natural lias limestone, in key locations to be determined through the masterplan.</u></li> <li>7. <u>Incorporation of green infrastructure, including: (a) on-site provision of well integrated allotments and play provision; (b) on or off-site ecological enhancements <del>within Manor Road Community Woodland</del>; and (c) on or off-site new planting, to provide an appropriate edge to development. New planting should maximise native species woodland edge habitat and provide for public access.</u></li> <li>8. <u>Existing hedgerows and hedgerow specimen trees should be retained and strengthened where shown on the concept diagram to provide a strong landscape and green infrastructure framework. Sufficient setback of development should allow for growth of trees, including within gardens and open spaces, which will eventually break up the rooflines and frame development.</u></li> </ol>	

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
			<p>9. <u>Utilise the green corridors through the development to provide new shared pedestrian and cycle routes. The general alignment of existing public rights of way should be retained, enhanced and connected with these new routes. Public space and footpaths should incorporate species-rich verges and grassland habitat.</u></p> <p>10. <u>The Roman road alignment and any surviving remains should be preserved by incorporating it into the development layout, preferably as open space or public footpath as part of the green infrastructure strategy.</u></p> <p>11. <u>Development to fully incorporate SuDS as part of the green infrastructure strategy. Streams and watercourses that cross the site should remain open, improved, and incorporated into the development as an attractive landscape and SuDS feature, with wetland habitat provided at in the North West part of the residential site.</u></p> <p>12. <u>Direct highway access from the residential site to be formed to the A4. Pedestrian and cycle access to be formed to the Chandag estate and to other points as shown on the concept diagram. The layout should be pedestrian and cycle dominant. A 'shared space' ethos for streets and spaces should prevail throughout the site. Connections to existing bus stops should be enhanced, with new stops provided within the site.</u></p> <p>13. <u>Direct highway access from the employment site to be formed to Pixash Lane.</u></p> <p>14. <u>The layout of the employment site should be designed to enable a future vehicular bridge over the railway line.</u></p> <p>15. <u>Off-site highway capacity improvements required, including the A4 and Broadmead roundabout, and Wellsway / Bath Road / Bath Hill junction.</u></p> <p>16. <u>Improve crossing facilities on the A4.</u></p> <p>17. <u>Improve pedestrian and cycle access to Wellsway School.</u></p> <p>18. <u>Development should be designed to allow future highway, pedestrian and cycle connections to the safeguarded land.</u></p> <p>19. <u>Provide land for a new Primary School on site and financial contributions for primary school accommodation proportionate to the expected pupil yield generated by the development. The new</u></p>	

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
			<p>school should be designed to facilitate future expansion, should have direct pedestrian and cycle access from the residential site and existing residential areas, and incorporate new junior playing pitches to be available for wider community use.</p> <p>20. <del>The solar energy potential of sites should be facilitated by design and orientation. Development will be expected to provide sufficient renewable energy generation to reduce carbon dioxide emissions from expected energy use in the buildings by at least 20%. Third party delivery options will be expected to have been considered and in exceptional circumstances Allowable Solutions may be utilised.</del></p> <p>21. <del>Non-residential developments of 1000m<sup>2</sup> or more will be expected to meet BREEAM Excellent (or equivalent) and smaller non-residential development will be expected to meet BREEAM Very Good (or equivalent) from 2014 onwards.</del></p> <p>22. <del>Downstream sewer improvements.</del></p>	
MM67	CSA34 Amendment made	Policy KE3B	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>POLICY KE3B Safeguarded Land at East Keynsham</u></b></p> <p><del>Land shown on the Key Diagram and Policies Map is removed from the Green Belt and safeguarded for possible development. The safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time and Policy CP8 will apply during the Plan period. Planning permission for development of the safeguarded land will be granted only when it is proposed for development following a review of the Local Plan after 2029 and once sufficient transport infrastructure improvements in the A4 corridor have been secured.</del></p>	No implications for the SA as infrastructure requirements will be considered as part of the plan review.
MM71	CSA37 (SPC120) Amendments made.	Policy KE4	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Land adjoining South West Keynsham</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Strategic Site Allocation</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Policy KE4</u></b></p> <p><del>Land is removed from the Green Belt as shown on the <i>Key Diagram</i> and <i>Policies Map</i> and</del></p>	

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
			<p><u>allocated for residential development and associated infrastructure during the Plan period.</u></p> <p><u>The requirements that need to be met to enable development are set out in the Placemaking Principles, Core Policies and indicated on the Concept Diagram. The Placemaking Principles, being site specific, take priority over the Core Policies.</u></p> <p><b><u>Placemaking Principles:</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Residential development (to include 30% affordable housing) of around 180-200 dwellings in the plan period at South West Keynsham as shown on the concept diagram- <del>The site should be developed at an average density of 35 dwellings per hectare.</del></u></li> <li>2. <u>Preparation of a comprehensive Masterplan, through public consultation, and to be agreed by the Council, reflecting best practice as embodied in 'By Design' (or successor guidance), ensuring that development is well integrated with neighbouring areas.</u></li> <li>3. <u>Dwellings should front onto Charlton Road and have a positive relationship with all publicly accessible routes. Development should face outwards towards the open countryside, adopting a perimeter block layout, with a clear distinction between the fronts and backs of properties.</u></li> <li>4. <u>Building heights to be generally limited to 2/2.5 storeys, ensuring development does not break the skyline in views from Queen Charlton Conservation Area.</u></li> <li>5. <u>Development should incorporate an element of traditional materials, including natural lias limestone, in key locations to be determined through the masterplan,.</u></li> <li>6. <u>Incorporation of green infrastructure, including on-site provision of well integrated formal and natural green space and play provision, and off-site enhancements to allotments. A key part of the on-site requirement should be the provision of woodland and copse planting along Parkhouse Lane as shown on the Concept Diagram, to provide a landscape buffer from views from the south and east, and strengthen the sylvan character of the area. New planting should maximise native species woodland edge habitat and provide for public access.</u></li> </ol>	Not significant.



Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
			<p>7. <u>Retain and strengthen the existing hedgerows and tree screening surrounding the site, with new screening along unplanted boundaries.</u></p> <p>8. <u>Retention and enhancement of internal hedgerows including hedgerow specimen trees, enabling the subdivision of the site into a number of development areas, and providing a strong landscape and green infrastructure framework. Sufficient setback of development should allow for growth of trees.</u></p> <p>9. <u>Utilise the green corridors through the development to provide shared pedestrian and cycle routes. Public space and footpaths should incorporate species-rich verges and grassland habitat.</u></p> <p>10. <u>Development to fully incorporate SuDS as part of the green infrastructure strategy to provide betterment to the existing surface water flood issues.</u></p> <p>11. <u>Direct highway access to be formed to Charlton Road with a through link to K2a sufficient to enable bus service provision to pass through the sites without turning.</u></p> <p>12. <u>The layout should be pedestrian and cycle dominant. A 'shared space' ethos for streets and spaces should prevail throughout the site.</u></p> <p>13. <u>Off-site highway capacity improvements to be determined by the Transport Impact Assessment at the application stage.</u></p> <p><u>Off site highway capacity improvements required, including the St Ladoc Road/A4175 Bristol Road/Trescothick Close roundabout and A37/Queen Charlton Lane junction</u></p> <p>14. <u>Financial contributions for primary school places and contribution in lieu of land will be required for primary school provision within the Keynsham primary school planning area.</u></p> <p>15. <u>The solar energy potential of sites should be facilitated by design and orientation. Development will be expected to provide sufficient renewable energy generation to reduce carbon dioxide emissions from expected energy use in the buildings by at least 20%. Third party delivery options will be expected to have been considered and in exceptional circumstances Allowable Solutions may be utilised.</u></p>	

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
			16. <u>Downstream sewer upsizing works and pumping station upgrade.</u>	
MM81	SPC130	Policy SV1 (3) – (4) (page 82)	<p><b>3 Economic Development</b></p> <p>a: Enable the delivery of around <del>4,000</del> <u>900</u> net additional jobs between <del>2006</del> <u>2011</u> and <del>2026</del> <u>2029</u> and facilitate further jobs if economic circumstances allow.</p> <p>b: Encourage the retention and expansion of local companies and the growth of new businesses by making provision for the changes in employment floorspace set out below: Office floorspace: from about <del>30,000</del> <u>31,000</u>m<sup>2</sup> in <del>2006</del> <u>2011</u> to about <del>40,000</del> <u>33,700</u>m<sup>2</sup> in <del>2026</del> <u>2029</u> Industrial/Warehouse floorspace: from about <del>440,000</del> <u>126,400</u>m<sup>2</sup> in <del>2006</del> <u>2011</u> to about <del>400,000</del> <u>112,000</u>m<sup>2</sup> in <del>2026</del> <u>2029</u> New employment floorspace will be focussed at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Westfield Industrial Estates, Midsomer Norton Enterprise Park and Bath Business Park in Peasedown St John</li> <li>• Old Mills in Paulton (Local Plan Policy GDS.1 V4)</li> <li>• Midsomer Norton and Radstock Town Centres</li> </ul> <p>c: Protect land in existing business use and <del>only allow alternative uses where there is employment benefit or which contributes to improvements to the town centres</del> <u>consider alternative use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose</u> and does not lead to an unacceptable loss of employment land.</p> <p><b>4. Housing</b></p> <p>a: Enable up to around <del>2,700</del> <u>2,470</u> new homes to be built at Midsomer Norton, Radstock, Westfield, Paulton and Peasedown St John, <u>by amending the housing development boundary as necessary and to reflect existing commitments</u>. This will include affordable housing, providing more choices of housing to meet the needs of the local communities. (Policies RA1 and RA2 are applicable to the other settlements in Somer Valley.)</p>	Update and clarification

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
	Amendment made		<p><del>b: Ensure that any new housing above the existing commitments of 2,200 dwellings is within the Housing Development Boundary and has either employment benefit or contributes to the implementation of the Town Park.</del></p>	No implication for the SA. The housing development boundary will be redrawn to include existing commitments.
MM93	SPC144  Amendment made	Policy RA2 (page 96)	<p><b>POLICY RA2 Development in villages outside the Green Belt not meeting policy RA1 criteria</b></p> <p>In villages outside the Green Belt with a housing development boundary defined on the Proposals Map and not meeting the criteria of policy RA1 proposals for <u>some limited residential development</u> and employment development will be acceptable where:</p> <p>a they are of a scale, character and appearance appropriate to the village</p> <p>b: in the case of residential development they lie within the housing development boundary</p> <p>c: in the case of employment development they lie within or adjoining the housing development boundary</p> <p><u>At the villages which meet the above criteria, residential development sites may also need to be identified in the Placemaking Plan and the housing development boundary reviewed accordingly to enable delivery of 1,120 dwellings identified on the Key Diagram. Limited residential development on sites adjoining the housing development boundary at these villages will be acceptable if identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan.</u></p>	Figure corrected (from 1,110. Not

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
				considered to be a significant change.
MM95	CSA45 (SPC146)	Policy RA5	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Land at Whitchurch</u></b> <b><u>Strategic Site Allocation</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Policy RA5</u></b></p> <p><u>Land is removed from the Green Belt as shown on the <i>Key Diagram</i> and <i>Policies Map</i> and allocated for residential development and associated infrastructure during the Plan period.</u></p> <p><u>The requirements that need to be met to enable development are set out in the <i>Placemaking Principles, Core Policies</i> and indicated on the <i>Concept Diagram</i>. The <i>Placemaking Principles</i>, being site specific, take priority over the <i>Core Policies</i>.</u></p> <p><b><u>Placemaking Principles:</u></b></p> <p><u>1. Residential led development (to include 40% affordable housing) of around <b>200 dwellings</b>, in the plan period. The site should be developed at an average density of 35-40dph</u></p> <p><u>2. Preparation of a comprehensive <b>Masterplan</b>, through public consultation, reflecting best practice as embodied in 'By Design' (or successor guidance), ensuring that it is well integrated with the existing village and provides links to south Bristol.</u></p> <p><u>3. Provision of <b>Green infrastructure</b> including multifunctional green space (formal, natural and allotments); well integrated Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems and habitat, pedestrian and</u></p>	Not a significant change.

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
	Amendment made		<p><u>cycle connectivity within the site and to the surrounding area. To include a multi-functional Green Infrastructure corridor as indicated on the <i>Concept Diagram</i>.</u></p> <p><u>4. New <b>Public Rights of Way</b> should be provided to enhance public access within the site and to the surrounding area. This should include a new north-south access across the site to enable a connection between the north of the site (Priests path) and Queen Charlton Lane.</u></p> <p><u>5 . A <b>Landscape and Ecological Mitigation Strategy and Management Scheme</b> is required to ensure satisfactory compensation, mitigation and protection and to inform site master planning, to include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Provision for bat foraging/ecological corridor enhancement</u></li> <li>• <u>Retention, enhancement and management of linear planting features</u></li> <li>• <u>Retention and protection of existing trees and significant hedgerows by inclusion within public open space, as shown on the <i>Concept Diagram</i> other than as required for access across the site in accordance with the agreed Masterplan.</u></li> <li>• <u>Provision of additional planting to provide visual screening and to maintain the wooded appearance of the site</u></li> <li>• <u>Retention of existing ponds, as indicated on the <i>Concept Diagram</i></u></li> <li>• <u>Use of new tree planting as a framework throughout the proposed development, with sufficient set back to allow growth of trees</u></li> <li>• <u>Retention of species rich grassland, as shown on the <i>Concept Diagram</i></u></li> <li>• <u>Minimise harm and provide enhancements to important landscape features and significant views, including:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <u>Queen Charlton Conservation Area and its setting</u></li> <li>○ <u>Maes Knoll Scheduled Monument and its setting</u></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>ENVIRON: this change is not considered to be significant. However, appraisal should be checked to ensure this is reflected.</p>

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <u>the character of the open plateau landscape leading towards the Chew Valley</u></li> </ul> <p>6 <u>. Development should ensure the conservation of the significance of affected heritage assets. As part of the Masterplan, the following should be addressed:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Limit the height and density of development to avoid and minimise harm to Queen Charlton Conservation Area</u></li> <li>• <u>Limit development height and density in more prominent areas, such as higher ground and development edges, in order to avoid the development breaking the skyline in wider views from the east</u></li> <li>• <u>Detailed archaeological assessment should inform the Masterplan</u></li> </ul> <p>7 <u>. <b>Transport</b> requirements are to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Provide vehicular access, and junction enhancement, to facilitate principal access to the site from Staunton Lane and Sleep Lane (linking to the new roundabout).</u></li> <li>• <u>Ensure the integration of this area into neighbouring developments, to provide more direct access to local facilities and services, and to encourage walking and cycling. The Masterplan will need to ensure development interconnects with Whitchurch village including enhanced safe and attractive pedestrian and cycle routes to the Local Centre and bus stops on the A37. A connection from the new site to National Cycle Route 3 should be facilitated.</u></li> <li>• <u>Provide links to existing bus routes and contribute towards improved local bus services and other local highway improvements (in both B&amp;NES and Bristol), including Queen Charlton Lane.</u></li> </ul> <p>8 <u>. Contributions will be required to facilitate the expansion of Whitchurch <b>Primary School</b> to accommodate the additional pupils generated from the development and to fund enlargement of the school site or the provision of a new playing field in a suitable location close to the school, to accommodate the additional building. A new Early Years facility will also need to be provided on site or nearby.</u></p> <p><u><del>Sustainable Construction will be required, with all new housing meeting Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5, or its successor, from 2014. The solar energy potential of sites should be facilitated</del></u></p>	Significant

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
	Amendment made		by design and orientation. Development will be expected to provide sufficient <b>renewable energy</b> generation to reduce carbon dioxide emissions from expected energy use in the buildings by at least 20%. Third party delivery options will be expected to have been considered and in exceptional circumstances Allowable Solutions may be utilised.	change for SA.
<b>MM101</b>	PC81 as amended	Policy CP2 (page 107)	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Policy CP2 Sustainable construction</b></p> <p>Sustainable design and construction will be integral to new development in Bath &amp; North East Somerset. All planning applications should include evidence that the standards below will be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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>);</li> <li>• Minimisation of waste <u>and maximising of recycling of any waste generated</u> during construction and in operation'</li> <li>• Conserving water resources and minimising vulnerability to flooding;</li> <li>• Efficiency in materials use, including the type, life cycle and source of materials to be used;</li> </ul>	The Inspector has made some changes to Policy CP2 to reflect his conclusions following discussions at the Hearings. Significant change for SA.

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
	Amendments made		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flexibility and adaptability, allowing future modification of use or layout, facilitating future refurbishment and retrofitting;</li> <li>Consideration of climate change adaptation.</li> </ul> <p>Applications for all development will need to be accompanied by a B&amp;NES Sustainable Construction Checklist</p> <p><i>Delete remainder of policy including table.</i></p> <p><i>Delete all of paragraph numbered 3 in Delivery.</i></p> <p><u>Major Development</u></p> <p><del>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. Major development as defined in the Town &amp; Country Planning (Development Management Procedure (England) Order 2010):</del></p> <p><del>The standards set out in the table below will be requirements for major development over the plan period:</del></p> <p><del>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.</del></p> <p><u>Amend the table in policy CP2 as follows:</u></p>	



Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications								
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change					SA screening
			Type of development	201-2012	2013	2016	2019	
			Residential Development*	Code for Sustainable Homes Code 3 (in full)	Code for Sustainable Homes code 4 (in full)	Code for Sustainable Homes Code 6 (in full i.e. zero carbon) Government Zero Carbon Standard for Homes	n/a	
			Non-Residential*				BREEAM Excellent (to include zero carbon)	
* Site specific targets may be set where viable, including for Green Belt Strategic Site Allocations								

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
MM101 A		Pages 107 & 108	<p>Delete paragraphs 6.09, 6.11, 6.12, 6.13, 6.14, and 6.15</p> <p><b>6.09</b> National methodologies for assessing sustainable construction in new buildings are currently set out in the Code for Sustainable Homes (CfSH) and Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM). Under the CfSH the rating for a dwelling is determined by nine categories: Energy and CO2 emissions, Pollution, Water, Health &amp; Wellbeing, Materials, Management, Surface Water run-off, Ecology &amp; Waste. The BREEAM standard for non-domestic dwellings uses similar categories. Both standards are awarded by a certified assessor and include options for design stage and post-occupancy assessments. The CO2 emissions of these sustainable construction targets are covered nationally via "Part L" of the Building Regulations and water elements are covered by "Part G".</p> <p><b>6.11</b> The Council is empowered to apply the full range of sustainable construction standards included in CfSH &amp; BREEAM, taking account of viability. Requiring that CfSH and BREEAM (or equivalent) assessments are undertaken for major development will ensure that sustainable construction is considered at the design stage of schemes. For example, CfSH assessments consider issues such as site waste management and household waste/recycling storage, energy, cycle storage, flexible spaces (such as potential for home office), responsible sourcing of materials, flood risk and drainage, considerate constructors scheme, sound insulation and ecological enhancements from the outset thereby raising the quality of a scheme.</p> <p><b>6.12</b> The Core Strategy requires all major residential development to meet CfSH standards in line with the stepping up of Building Regulations. Code for Sustainable Homes level 6 is considered to be zero carbon (although the precise definition is still to be clarified by the government), and unlike level 5, it requires both regulated and unregulated emissions be considered (i.e. additionally includes white goods).</p>	The Inspector has deleted much of the supporting text for Policy CP2. Significant change for SA.

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
			<p><del>6.13 All major non-residential developments are required to undertake and submit a BREEAM assessment. Interim targets in the lead up to 2019 have not been set at this stage.</del></p> <p><del>6.14 The costs associated with the assessment processes means that the Council only requires these assessments for major development (as defined in The Town &amp; Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order, 2010).</del></p> <p><del>6.15 Evidence to underpin this strategy, including evidence to show that the stepped CfSH targets are viable and technically feasible is included in the Council's Viability Study (2010) and in the Renewable Energy and Planning Research (2009 &amp; 2010). The use of flexible mechanisms such as "allowable solutions" or offsite generation will contribute to the achievement of zero carbon development.</del></p>	
MM105	SPC161 (PC83)	Para 6.28a (page 112)	<p>The Flood Risk Management Strategy (June 2010) has identified and assessed a range of flood risk management options to enable development in vulnerable areas without increasing the flood risk elsewhere. The Strategy has concluded that there is no strategic solution to reducing peak flow through Bath which is either technically or economically viable. <del>As such the Strategy proposes the provision of compensatory storage upstream combined with on site flood defences. New development must provide storage to offset the volume of water that would be displaced in a flood event by the defences on site.</del> Following the Flood Risk Management Strategy, the Hydraulic Modelling (Bath Flood Risk Management Project Feb 2013 by B&amp;V) was prepared. <u>The impact of raising the key development sites in the Central Area and the Enterprise Area in Bath is a loss of conveyance, rather than a loss of flood storage. It recommends, where necessary, to raise all the development sites and the access/egress routes (or raise defence walls) and implement conveyance mitigation measures. New development should be safe and not increase risk</u></p>	Very minor change - deletion of 'It

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
		Amendment made	elsewhere.	confirms that' at the start of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence of the underlined text for clarity.  No implication for final SA
MM108	CSA49  Amendment made	Para 6.63 (page 120)	Core Policy CP8 conforms with national policy which also states that the general extent and detailed boundaries of the Green Belt should be altered only exceptionally. <u>The Core Strategy retains the general extent of the Green Belt in B&amp;NES other than the removal of land from the Green Belt for development on the edge of Bath and Keynsham and at Whitchurch as set out in Policy DW1 and Policies B3A, KE3A and B, KE4 and RA5.</u>	Reference B3B (Weston) removed. Significant change for the SA. Remainder of para 6.63 included in the Schedule of Additional Mods (MM108).
MM109	CSA50 (SPC172)	Para 6.63A	<u>In altering the Green Belt and allocating strategic sites for development and in response to the NPPF paragraph 85, the need to identify safeguarded land to meet longer term development requirements has been considered. At Odd Down on the edge of Bath</u> environmental sensitivity	Reference to Weston deleted. Change needs

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
	Amendments made		means that there is no scope to identify safeguarded land. It is also considered there is no scope to identify safeguarded land at south west Keynsham. However, land is safeguarded for development East of Keynsham. At Whitchurch the need for and scope to identify safeguarded land will be considered as part of the Core Strategy review.	to be reflected in the SA..
MM119	SPC179  Amendment made	Para 6.76 (page 122)	<del>To better understand the workings of housing markets at the sub-regional and local level the Council jointly commissioned a SHMA which appraised the housing market across the subregion of the West of England. The SHMA shows that an increasing proportion of the total dwelling stock is accounted for by the private rented sector. The SHMA estimates that around 36% of the requirement for overall housing between 2011 and 2031 is for affordable homes. The assessment, published in 2009, has demonstrated a high level of need for affordable housing throughout the district, taking account of current and future projected market conditions. The level of unmet affordable housing need is high and based on the evidence from the SHMA the Council could theoretically require 100% of all future planned residential development to be affordable housing. The SHMA assumes that the contribution to the provision of housing needs from private rented accommodation where occupiers are receiving housing benefit will continue at a similar scale in the future. If this contribution were to significantly fall, the need for affordable housing would increase.</del>	Clarification  No implications for the SA.
MM123	SPC184 (RC49, PC91 as amended)	Policy CP9 Large sites (page	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Policy CP9 Affordable Housing</b></p> <p><i>Delete all the text under the headings <b>Large sites</b> and <b>Small sites</b> and insert the following 3 headings and text:</i></p> <p><b>Large sites</b></p> <p><u>Affordable housing will be required as on-site provision in developments of 10 dwellings or 0.5</u></p>	

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
	SPC185	123)	<p>hectare and above (the lower threshold applies). <u>The following percentage targets will be sought:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>40% in Prime Bath, Bath North and East, Bath Rural Hinterland;</u></li> <li>- <u>30% in Bath North and West, Bath South, Keynsham and Saltford, Midsomer Norton, Westfield, Radstock, Peasedown St John, Paulton and Chew Valley.</u></li> </ul> <p><u>This is on a grant free basis with the presumption that on site provision is expected.</u></p> <p><b>Small sites</b></p> <p><u>Residential developments on small sites from 5 to 9 dwellings or from 0.25 up to 0.49 hectare (the lower threshold applies) 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 20% for AH area 1 and 15% for AH area 2 47.5%, half that of large sites, in order to encourage delivery.</u></p> <p><u>In terms of the affordable housing on small sites, the Council will first consider if on site provision is appropriate. In some instances 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.</u></p> <p><b>Viability</b></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"> <li>• <u>Whether grant or other public subsidy is available</u></li> <li>• <u>Whether there are exceptional build or other development costs</u></li> <li>• <u>The achievement of other planning objectives</u></li> <li>• <u>The tenure and size mix of the affordable housing to be provided.</u></li> </ul> <p><u>A higher (up to 45%) proportion of affordable housing may be sought where supported by the</u></p>	<p>Clarification</p> <p>No implications for SA.</p>
	SPC186 (RC50, PC91 as amended)			

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
	Amendment made		<p><del>assessment of viability of the proposed development, or provision below the average of 35% may be accepted.</del></p> <p><i>Make the following amendments to the existing remaining text of the policy</i></p> <p><b>Sub-division and phasing</b></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><b>Tenure</b></p> <p><i>Text deleted</i></p> <p><b>Property Size and Mix</b></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><b>Other</b></p> <p>All affordable housing delivered through this policy should remain at an affordable price for future eligible households, <del>in the event of any sales or staircasing affecting affordable housing unit(s) delivered through CP9 then an arrangement will be made to recycle the receipts/subsidy for the</del></p>	
		SPC187		

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
	(PC91 as amended)  SPC188 (RC51, PC91 as amended)		provision of new alternative affordable housing located elsewhere within Bath and North East Somerset. Affordable Housing should be integrated within a development and should not be distinguishable from market housing.	
<b>MM128</b>	SPC195 (FPC21)  Amendment made	New Para 6.81a	<u>In March 2012 the Government published 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites', alongside the NPPF, which seeks to align planning policy for Travellers with housing. This requires the Council to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable sites and a further five and where possible, ten year supply of developable sites. The Council has undertaken a refreshed assessment of need which updates the West of England Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment undertaken in 2007 for the Bath &amp; North East Somerset area. This establishes the level of need for five, ten and fifteen year supply of sites in accordance with Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. Most of the need is from households on unauthorised sites and is therefore an immediate need. From the evidence in the GTAA, there is an immediate need for 24 pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and a further 4 pitches between 2017 and 2027 and 5 transit pitches, and an immediate need for 40 Travelling Showmen's plots. The Council will identify sites to meet these needs in the Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document.</u> Planning Policy for Traveller Sites clarifies that for a site to be considered deliverable it must be available now and offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable and viable with a realistic prospect it can be delivered within five years.	Clarification and accuracy.  No implications for SA of the Core Strategy.
<b>MM129</b>	SPC196	New para	<u>Planning Policy for Traveller Sites states that Traveller sites should be guided towards making effective use of previously developed, untidy or derelict land. It also states that development in the</u>	



Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
	Amendment made	6.81b	open countryside away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the development plan should be strictly limited. It does recognise, however, that some rural areas may be suitable for traveller's sites providing the scale of these sites does not dominate the nearest settled community and avoid placing an undue pressure on local infrastructure. Any proposed sites inside settlement boundaries would be considered against policies applying generally to residential development. Provision is more likely to be made outside such boundaries and will be guided by policy CP11.	Clarification No implications for SA.
MM130	SPC197 (FPC21)  Amendment made	New para 6.82 (page 124)	<i>(includes part of previous para 6.81c)</i>  The NPPF establishes a presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated and the harm caused can be outweighed by other considerations. Planning Policy for Traveller Sites reiterates that sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. However, if exceptional circumstances exist, an allocation can be made in a DPD by removing land from the Green Belt. The criteria in Policy CP11 will be used to guide the identification of suitable sites for allocation in the relevant DPD and to identify sites to meet respond to 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.	Clarification. No implications for SA.
MM131	SPC198 (FPC22)	Policy CP11 (page 124)	<b>POLICY CP11 Gypsies, Travellers &amp; Travelling Showpeople</b>  The following criteria will be used to guide the identification and allocation of suitable, available and deliverable or developable sites in a Development Plan Document to respond to the established accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople to 2011 and their accommodation needs beyond 2011 once assessed for the Plan period. Proposals for Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople accommodation will be considered against the following criteria allocated and planning applications permitted taking into account the following	Change to ensure it is clear

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications				
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change	SA screening
	Amendment made		<p><b>factors:</b></p> <p>a: <u>the site is suitably located to allow access to local community services and facilities, including shops, schools and health facilities, and employment opportunities</u> <del>should be accessible by foot, cycle and public transport .</del></p> <p>b: <u>satisfactory means of access can be provided and the existing highway network is adequate to service the site</u></p> <p>c: <u>the site is large enough to allow for adequate space for on-site facilities and amenity amenities including play provision, parking and manoeuvring, as well as any commercial activity-live/work pitches if required to enable traditional lifestyles</u></p> <p>d: <u>the site is well-designed and well-landscaped</u> <del>does not harm</del> <u>and has no unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area</u></p> <p>e: <u>adequate services including utilities, foul and surface water and waste disposal can be provided as well as any necessary pollution control measures</u></p> <p>f: <del>use of the site must have</del> <u>there is no harmful unacceptable impact on the amenities, health and well-being of occupiers of the site or on neighbouring occupiers as a result of the development</u></p> <p>g: <u>the site should avoid areas at high risk of flooding and have no adverse impact on protected habitats and species, nationally recognised designations, landscape designations and heritage assets and their settings and natural resources</u></p> <p>h: <u>the scale of the development does not dominate the nearest settled community nor place undue pressure on the local infrastructure</u></p> <p>i: <u>the site does not lie within the Green Belt unless there are exceptional circumstances to justify making an allocation by removing land from the Green Belt or, for a planning application</u></p>	<p>that the policy relates to both the allocation of sites and to considering planning applications.</p> <p>Clarification</p> <p>No implications for the SA.</p> <p>Change to ensure it is clear that the policy</p>

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications													
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change		SA screening								
	Amendment made		<p>on unallocated land, that very special circumstances exist.</p> <p><b>Delivery:</b> 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 for the Plan period.</p>		<p>relates to the allocation of sites and to considering planning applications.</p> <p>No implications for the SA.</p>								
MM132	SPC200	Delivery - end of para 6.87	Not required for soundness.		<p>Included in the Schedule of Additional Mods (MM132).</p> <p>Appraised in March 2013 - no change.</p>								
MM134	FPC24 FPC25		<p><b>Table 9 Monitoring of Strategic Objectives</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Strategic Objective</th> <th>Policy</th> <th>Indicator</th> <th>Quantification of Objective Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Pursue a low carbon and sustainable future</td> <td>CP1 Retrofitting existing</td> <td>No changes required for soundness</td> <td>No changes required for soundness</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Strategic Objective	Policy	Indicator	Quantification of Objective Target	1. Pursue a low carbon and sustainable future	CP1 Retrofitting existing	No changes required for soundness	No changes required for soundness	<p>Relates to changes to Policy CP2</p> <p>No implications for the SA.</p>
Strategic Objective	Policy	Indicator	Quantification of Objective Target										
1. Pursue a low carbon and sustainable future	CP1 Retrofitting existing	No changes required for soundness	No changes required for soundness										

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications							
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change				SA screening
			in a changing climate	buildings			However, need to reflect changes in the monitoring schedule.
				CP2 Sustainable Construction	Delete all indicators	Delete all targets.	
	SPC204 (RC54)			CP3 Renewable Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proportion and number of renewable energy schemes granted planning permission annually</li> <li>Amount of renewable energy generated by installed capacity, for electricity (MWe) and heat (MWth)</li> <li>Amount of renewable energy generated from renewable energy</li> </ul>	<p><b>By 2026 2029</b></p> <p>110MWe (Electricity) 165 MWth (Heat)</p>	

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications							
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change				SA screening
	SPC205				sources annually (measured via 'Feed in Tariff data).		
			CP4 District Heating		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location of heat priority areas where policy district heating schemes have started to be implemented</li> <li>Proportion and number of Combined Heat and Power schemes granted planning permission annually</li> </ul>		
			CP5 Flood Risk Management		Number of planning permissions granted contrary		

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications							
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change				SA screening
					to Environment Agency advice		
			2. Protect and enhance the District's natural, built and cultural assets and provide green infrastructure	<b>CP6</b> Environmental Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change in priority habitats (in hectares)</li> <li>Number of nature conservation sites that are enhanced annually</li> <li>Number and proportion of housing schemes <del>meeting</del> <u>achieving</u> Building for Life 42 (BfL12) <del>good standard</del> <u>score of no 'reds'</u> annually (post-construction monitoring)</li> <li>Number of principal</li> </ul>	Maintain or increase the area of priority habitats by <u>2026-2029</u>  Annual increase in the proportion of assessed housing schemes that meet the Building for Life 42 (BfL12) <del>good standard</del> <u>scoring no 'reds'</u>  Reduce the number of principal listed buildings recorded as 'at risk' on the Council's Buildings at Risk Register  Increase the number of up to date Conservation	

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications							
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change				SA screening
					listed buildings recorded as 'at risk' on the Council's Buildings at Risk Register <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of up to date Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans in place</li> <li>• Adoption of Historic Environment related SPDs</li> </ul>	Area Appraisals and Management Plans in place	
					A range of indicators to monitor implementation of the actions identified in the World Heritage Site Management Plan are also		

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications							
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change				SA screening
				<p>identified in the Management Plan.</p> <p><i>Protection of Greenfield land through prioritising development of previously developed sites relates also to regeneration and housing delivery objective – see indicator and quantification below</i></p>			
			<p><b>CP7 Green Infrastructure</b></p>	<p>A range of indicators to monitor the provision and enhancement of green infrastructure are being developed</p>			



Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications							
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change				SA screening
					as part of the Green Infrastructure Strategy		
			3. Encourage economic development, diversification and prosperity	<b>DW1</b> District-wide spatial strategy and Place based spatial strategies: B1 KE1 SV1 RA1&2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amount of floor space developed type (office/industrial) in sqm, by place annually and total since <del>2006</del> <u>2011</u>. Gains, losses and net.</li> <li>Amount of floor space on previously developed land by type (office/industrial) in sqm, by place annually and total since <del>2006</del> <u>2011</u>. Gains, losses and net.</li> <li>Employment</li> </ul>	Deliver space to provide <del>8,700</del> <b>10,170</b> <u>10,300</u> net additional jobs between <del>2006</del> <u>2011</u> & <del>2026</del> <u>2029</u> as set out in the places below Bath: <del>2006</del> <u>2011-2026</u> <u>2029</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Office floor space – net gain of about <del>70,000</del> <u>40,000m<sup>2</sup></u></li> <li>Industrial floor space – net loss of about <del>30,000</del> <u>40,000m<sup>2</sup></u></li> <li><u>Net increase in</u> <del>5,700</del> <u>7,000</u></li> </ul>	Changes to reflect updated figure in Policy DW1.  No implications for the SA.

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications							
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change				SA screening
	SPC206 (RC55) Amendment made				<p>ent land available by type</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change in work place jobs by sub-area</li> <li>Number of planning consents for business premises in rural areas</li> <li>Economic growth forecasts from the Office of Budget Responsibility (OBR) as well as from bodies such as Oxford Economics, Cambridge Econometrics, NIESR</li> </ul>	<p>jobs</p> <p>Keynsham: <del>2006</del> 2011 – <del>2026</del> 2029</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Office floor space – net gain of about <del>40,000</del> 7,200 m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>Industrial floor space – <del>no net change</del> net gain of about 8,300m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>Net increase in <del>1,500</del> of about 1,600 jobs</li> </ul> <p>Somer Valley: <del>2006</del> 2011-2026 2029</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Office floor space – net gain of about <del>40,00</del> 2,700m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>Industrial floor space – net loss of about <del>40,000</del> 14,400m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>Net</li> </ul>	

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications							
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change				SA screening
	FPC27		4. Invest in our city, town and local centres	<b>CP12</b> Centres and retailing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proportion of new retail floor space provided within the centres listed in the hierarchy annually in total since 2006</li> <li>Health of the centres as indicated by r</li> </ul> <p>Retail floor space 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>increase of about 900 jobs</p> <p>Health of each centre as measured by the indicators specified is maintained or enhanced</p> <p>The market share of comparison goods spending as measured by household surveys undertaken about every 5 years is maintained or enhanced</p>	

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications							
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change				SA screening
	CSA54 SPC207 (RC56, PC97)				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Market share of comparison goods spending in Bath city centre and the town centres</u></li> </ul>		
			5. Meet housing needs	DW1 District-wide spatial strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Net additional dwelling completions for B&amp;NES annually and total since 2006</u></li> <li>• <u>Housing delivery trajectory (updated annually)</u></li> <li>• total housing stock by tenure and type</li> <li>• housing permissions granted by tenure and type</li> </ul>	<p><b>Deliver</b> 12,700 homes by 2029.</p> <p>Calculation of housing land supply (expressed in years)</p> <p>The five year housing land supply position after 2015/2016 will be used as a strong indication of the achievability of housing delivery to the end of the plan period in accordance with</p>	

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications							
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change				SA screening
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>housing permissions developed by tenure and type</li> <li>housing delivery trajectory showing completions and forecast completions</li> <li>% affordable housing secured on qualifying sites</li> </ul>	<p><del>the Core Strategy.</del></p> <p><u>Around 13,000 homes, comprising 9710 market homes and 3290 affordable homes 2011-2029. 40% or 30% affordable housing secured on large sites depending on geographic location</u></p> <p><u>20% or 10% affordable housing secured on small sites depending on geographic location</u></p>	
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change in resident student numbers</li> <li>Change in purpose-built student accommodati</li> </ul>	<p><u>Growth in student numbers matches growth in purpose-built</u></p>	

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications							
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change				SA screening
					on	accommodation at each plan review.	Changes to reflect amendments to Policy DW1  No implications for the SA.
			Place based spatial strategies B1 KE1 SV1 RA1&2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual residential dwelling completions by place <del>As</del> above but broken down for (Bath, Keynsham, Somer Valley &amp; rural areas)</li> </ul>	Deliver housing as set out in Table 1B		
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of new homes provided on previously developed land annually and since 2006 in B&amp;NES</li> </ul>	Around 80% of new housing provided between <del>2006 2011</del> and <del>2026 2029</del> should be on previously developed land		
			CP10 Housing mix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual residential dwelling completions broken down</li> </ul>			

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications							
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change				SA screening
	SPC208 (RC57)				by size of property (number of bedrooms) and tenure		
	Amendment made		<p><b>CP9</b> Affordable Housing</p> <p><b>RA4</b> Rural exception sites</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of new affordable homes completed annually since 2006</li> <li>Percentage of affordable homes completed on sites meeting the large site and small site thresholds</li> <li>Number of rural exceptions site delivered</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3,400 affordable homes completed by 2026</li> <li>Average of 35% of all homes provided on large sites across the District should be affordable homes</li> </ul>		
			<b>CP11</b> Gypsies, travellers travelling showpeople	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Net additional gypsy and traveller pitches provided</li> </ul>	<p><i>Delete existing indicators and insert.</i></p> <p><i>Delivery indicators to be identified in</i></p>		

Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications							
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change				SA screening
					annually and since 2006-11	<u>the Gypsy and Traveller DPD.</u>	
	SPC209		6. Plan for development that promotes health and well being	<b>CP13</b> Infrastructure Provision. Place based strategies (AQMA's) B1 KE1	Annual progress on the delivery of infrastructure will be reported via the Infrastructure Delivery Programme. Including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress on scheme delivery and funding</li> <li>• Status and risk of infrastructure planned</li> <li>• Annual Progress Report on Air Quality management Areas as submitted to DEFRA (by Environmental Health)</li> </ul>	<u>By 2016 within the Bath AQMA and Keynsham AQMA annual average concentrations of Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) not to exceed 40µg/m<sup>3</sup></u>	Change to reflect amendments associated with Policy CP11.  No implications for the SA.
	SPC210 (FPC29)						
	SPC211 (FPC30)						
	<b>Amendment made</b>						
			7. Deliver well		• 17 11		



Table M3.1 Screening of the June 2014 Main Modifications								
Main Mod	Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft CS	Proposed Change				SA screening	
	FPC31		connected places accessible by sustainable means of transport		transport related <del>targets</del> indicators are monitored as part of JLTP3. <a href="http://www.travelplus.org.uk/media/187017/12%20targets%20and%20monitoring.pdf">http://www.travelplus.org.uk/media/187017/12%20targets%20and%20monitoring.pdf</a> (page 2)			
	FPC32							

## 4 Results of Screening: Additional Modifications June 2014

In addition to the Main Modifications set out in Table M3.1, the table below (Table M4.1) sets out additional (minor) changes put forward by Bath and North East Somerset Council, which are not necessary for 'soundness' but are considered necessary by the Council for completeness. In order not to duplicate the previous tables in this annex, the additional changes are shown in isolation from the Main Modifications (in Table M3.1).

Table M4.1 Screening of Additional Modifications June 2014			
Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft Core Strategy	Proposed Change	Significant change for SA?
PC29	Western Riverside Policy Approach (page 45)	The spatial strategy retains the planning principles that have been established for this area. Local Plan Policy GDS.1/B1 for Western Riverside continues to apply to the area shown in Diagram 6 and is saved as part of the Development Plan. For Riverside East, beyond the extent of the approved outline planning permission <u>both Policy GDS.1/B1 and Policy B2 apply.</u>	No. The change is only editorial.
	Policy B3A (Page 47)	2. Preparation of a comprehensive Masterplan, through public consultation, <u>and agreed by the Council,</u> reflecting best practice as embodied in 'By Design' (or successor guidance), ensuring that it is well integrated with neighbouring areas.	No. This will ensure masterplans are approved by the Council and are therefore in line with planning policy.
	Key to Concept Diagram for Land adjoining South West Keynsham	<i>Add notation for 'Additional Green Infrastructure' and 'Green Infrastructure Link' to the key to Concept Diagram for Land adjoining South West Keynsham</i>	No. Change is only editorial.
-	Para 4.05 (page 76)	<u>For the purposes of the Core Strategy housing targets, the Somer Valley Area</u> includes Midsomer Norton, Westfield, Radstock, Peasedown St John, <u>and</u> Paulton, <del>Shoscombe,</del>	This change removes some villages from the

Table M4.1 Screening of Additional Modifications June 2014			
Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft Core Strategy	Proposed Change	Significant change for SA?
		<del>Camerton, Timsbury, High Littleton and Farrington Gurney.</del>	'Somerset Valley' but this does not have an effect on the SA. The appraisals of the Somerset Valley have mainly identified effects on the two key settlements of Midsomer Norton and Radstock.
-	Policy RA5	Preparation of a comprehensive <b>Masterplan</b> , through public consultation, <u>and agreed by the Council</u> , reflecting best practice as embodied in 'By Design' (or successor guidance), ensuring that it is well integrated with the existing village and provides links to south Bristol.	No. This will ensure masterplans are approved by the Council and are therefore in line with planning policy.
-	Para 6.21 (page 109)	It is possible to vary the energy source to fuel district heating depending on cost and availability so the energy source can be changed over time; potential fuel sources include conventional fuels, biomass, and waste and other renewables. The <del>emerging</del> West of England Joint Waste Core Strategy provides a policy framework for energy recovery from waste.	No. Change is factual.
-	Para 6.25 (page 112)	The dominant flood risk affecting the district is flooding from <u>Main Rivers</u> . The principal rivers being the Lower Avon, River Chew, Cam Brook and Wellow Brook. The district also contains areas that are prone to flooding from a range of other <u>local</u> sources including <u>sewers</u> , <u>ordinary watercourses</u> , <del>and</del> <u>surface water</u> , and groundwater, as well as risks from artificial sources such as <u>sewers</u> , <u>canals</u> and <u>reservoirs</u> . Climate change impacts may increase the severity and frequency of storms and therefore <u>contribute to</u>	No. Changes reflect updated baseline data.

Table M4.1 Screening of Additional Modifications June 2014			
Origin of the change	Plan Ref/ Page in Draft Core Strategy	Proposed Change	Significant change for SA?
		<del>more frequent flooding. Flooding from rivers, sewers and surface water is therefore likely to increase</del> throughout the district in the future.	
	Para 6.31 (page 112)	SuDS aim to control surface water runoff as close to its origin as possible, before it is discharged to a watercourse or sewer. This involves moving away from traditional piped drainage systems towards softer engineering solutions <del>which seek</del> <u>aiming</u> to mimic natural drainage regimes. SuDS have many benefits such as reducing flood risk, improving water quality, encouraging groundwater recharge and providing amenity and wildlife benefits.	No. The meaning is the same.
	Para 6.32 (page 112)	Under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 the Council <del>will be</del> <u>is</u> established as <del>the a</del> <u>a</u> Lead Local Flood Authority, <del>going forward this will require the</del> <u>and is currently developing</u> <del>ment and implementation of</del> <u>Local Flood Risk Management Strategy</u> . The Council will also be established as the SuDS Approving Body ( <u>SAB</u> ) with responsibility for the approval, adoption and maintenance of SuDS systems. In order to be approved, the proposed drainage system <del>should meet</del> <u>will have to be designed and constructed in accordance with the new</u> national standards for sustainable drainage <u>and WoE Regional and local guidance</u> . Where both planning permission and SuDS approval are required, the <u>application</u> processes <del>will run in parallel together</del> . <u>No construction works can start on site until drainage approval is granted by SAB.</u>	No. Change makes requirements for SUDS clearer and more certain.
-	Para 6.70 (page 121)	The JWCS Development Plan Document ( <u>March 2011</u> ) <del>will set</del> <u>sets</u> out the planning strategy for the provision of waste management infrastructure within the West of England. The Strategy is being prepared by the four West of England unitary authorities of B&NES, Bristol, North Somerset and South Gloucestershire Councils.	No. Reflects updated reference.