

**Bath & North East Somerset
Local Plan (Core Strategy /Placemaking Plan)
2011-2029 Partial Update**

**Publication Consultation
(Reg 19)**

August 2021

Consultation Statement

**Bath & North East
Somerset Council**

Improving People's Lives

Bath & North East Somerset Local Plan Partial Review - Consultation Statement relating to Launch and Options stages

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This statement sets out the consultation and community involvement undertaken during the preparation of Bath and North East Somerset Council's Local Plan Partial Update. This is in accordance with Regulation 18 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.
- 1.2 The Planning Regulations require that the Council must consult each of the statutory consultees, general consultation bodies, public and business community on the Local Plan and invite each of them to make representations on its scope and content.
- 1.3 This statement explains how the consultation was undertaken and who has been consulted; details of how they were consulted; and a summary of the issues raised and how those main issues have been addressed in preparing the pre-submission (or publication) draft Plan.
- 1.4 At this stage the Consultation Statement focusses on explaining consultation undertaken at the Launch (commencement) stage and the Options consultation. The Consultation Statement will be subsequently updated following each stage of plan preparation. Therefore, it will next be updated and published alongside the Submission, setting out details of the Publication Draft Plan (Regulation 19) consultation.

2 About the Local Plan Partial Update

- 2.1 The Local Plan is made up of the Core Strategy (adopted in 2014) and the Placemaking Plan (adopted in 2017), both of which cover a period from 2011 to 2029. The Council had already started work on a new Local Plan, to cover the period 2016 to 2036; however, the withdrawal of the West of England Joint Spatial Plan means that work on this plan will not continue. The Local Plan partial update will update some policies within the Core Strategy and Placemaking Plan. This partial update is not a new Local Plan, and will not roll forward or change the plan period of the adopted Core Strategy and Placemaking Plan.
- 2.2 These are the main areas of the Local Plan that we are updating in our Partial Update:
 - updating particular policies, to address changes in circumstances and national policy and legislation since our [Core Strategy](#) was adopted in 2014, particularly the Council's declaration of a [Climate Emergency and Ecological Emergency](#)
 - updating and replenishing housing supply, in order to ensure we can meet our Core Strategy requirement for housing up to 2029

- reviewing and updating specific policies to address a number of other urgent issues, such as transport policies, including reviewing parking standards, and houses in multiple occupation (HMOs)
- 2.3 The Commencement document was presented as a discussion document, designed for community and stakeholder engagement and to generate discussion on the scope of the partial update, why it is being prepared and the programme for its preparation. Alongside the commencement document the list of Core Strategy & Placemaking Plan policies proposed to be updated at this time was also published for comment. A summary of the wide range of issues that were raised at this stage is set out in **Annex 1**
- 2.4 The Options Document set out the Council's options for addressing the issues identified within the Commencement Document. The aim of the Options Document was to open discussion and give residents and other stakeholders a chance to comment on the options, or potential approaches, for addressing some of the critical issues facing Bath and North East Somerset.
- 2.5 **Annex 2** summarises the key issues raised during the Options consultation under Regulation 18 and the Council's response in preparing the pre-submission draft Local Plan Partial Update (to be subject to consultation under Reg 19).
Annex 3 summarises the minor amendments to the Housing Development Boundaries (HDB) raised during the Launch and Options (call for sites) consultation under Regulation 18 and the Council's response in preparing the pre-submission draft Local Plan Partial Update (to be subject to consultation under Reg 19).

3 Consultation approach

- 3.1 With the introduction of the Localism Act, communities are empowered more than ever before to help shape the future of development in their neighbourhoods. The Council attaches significant importance to working with local communities in planning and placemaking in accordance with the Council's corporate priority of 'giving people a bigger say', and the Council's approach is set out in the Council's [Neighbourhood Planning Protocol](#) (Statement of Community Involvement).
- 3.2 The information set out in this consultation report demonstrates compliance with the Neighbourhood Planning Protocol methods of community involvement and outlines the consultation activities undertaken, who was consulted, and how they were consulted.

Launch consultation (Commencement Document) (April – June 2020)

4 Introduction

- 4.1 In order to initiate discussion on the Local Plan Partial Update the Council prepared a Commencement Document which was agreed for consultation by [Single Member Decision on the 23rd of March 2020](#). The commencement document and accompanying schedule of policies was published for consultation, in compliance with [Regulation 18 of the Local Plan Regulations](#), between the 6th of April and 1st of June 2020.
- 4.2 Due to the unprecedented situation caused by Covid-19, and after careful consideration by the Council, the consultation was held online only. The consultation was opened for a longer period than would usually be the case, with an 8-week consultation period, and flexibility was given in respect of the consultation comments deadline. As would normally be the case at the commencement stage no public events or exhibitions were planned to take place alongside the publication of the commencement document.
- 4.3 The Commencement document was presented as a discussion document, designed for community and stakeholder engagement and to generate discussion on the scope and timetable for the Partial Update. To aid the respondent a series of questions were included at strategic points in the text to stimulate debate. These were:
- Do you have any comments on the proposed scope and content of the Local Plan Partial Update, and the policies to be updated?
 - Do you have any comments on the programme for the preparation of the Local Plan Partial Update?
 - Do you have any other specific observations to make on the Local Plan Partial Update?

5 Information on the Launch consultation

Notification mailout

- 5.1 Information about the consultation was issued prior to the start of the consultation period by email/letter on 6th April 2020 to all those on the mailing list which included statutory consultees and a range of other stakeholders. Whilst the mailout encouraged people to submit their comments electronically using the comment form provided, it was made clear that letters would also be accepted.
- 5.2 The Parish and Town Councils were mailed separately with the same information.

Press release and media coverage

- 5.3 A press release was issued to remind residents and others of the opportunity to comment on the Commencement document and list of policies proposed to be updated. This was picked up in the local press including:

Local Press

- Bath Echo
- Bath Newseum
- Family Matters

Comment Form

- 5.4 The Council produced a Comment Form in the form of a SurveyMonkey website for those who wished to respond to the consultation. It included clear information on how to respond using the form.

Dedicated webpage

- 5.5 A webpage relating to the consultation could be accessed via links from the main Planning Policy webpage and on the dedicated Local Plan webpage.
- 5.6 The webpage set out the following information:

- An overview of the purpose of Local Plan Partial Update and the reasons why a review is being undertaken
- Consultation Details: how to respond and links to the consultation material, including the comments form
- Next steps following the consultation and other opportunities for users to get involved with planning policy, e.g. responding to the call for sites

Direct Contact Information

- 5.7 An email address was provided on all the consultation material, mail-outs, and website for those who wanted to ask direct questions and seek further information.
- 5.8 For respondents unable to comment electronically, written comments could be posted to the Council's mailing address.

Call for Sites

- 5.9 The consultation also included a 'call for sites' exercise, enabling communities and other stakeholders to submit sites they consider to be potentially suitable for development for housing, employment uses or renewable energy development through the Local Plan Partial Update.
- 5.10 The sites submitted would inform the technical evidence supporting the Local Plan, such as the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA). The HELAA is a technical assessment process of the suitability of land for development, which also includes availability and achievability. The HELAA process does not affect the planning status of any land which is assessed.

6 Stakeholder engagement

- 6.1 As would normally be the case at the commencement stage no public events or exhibitions were planned to take place alongside the publication of the commencement document.
- 6.2 To assist Parish and Councils a recorded presentation was issued during the consultation in order to explain the purposes of the consultation and the call for sites and address some of the more common queries. The presentation included an audio commentary.

7 Representations on the Commencement document

- 7.1 The consultation generated around 400 representations from a range of stakeholders including residents, parish councils, residents' associations in Bath and developers/planning agents.
- 7.2 By the end of the consultation approximately 200 respondents had submitted comments using the on-line consultation system, around 180 by email and 4 by post.
- 7.3 [A Schedule of the comments](#) received can be viewed on the Council's website.

Summary of the main issues raised through the consultation

- 7.4 A summary of the wide range of issues that were raised is set out in **Annex 1**. Many of the comments related to specific sites or potential policy approaches/solutions. These were useful in informing the next stages in the Local Plan process.
- 7.5 The consultation at this stage was principally seeking views on the urgent issues it is proposed to address and therefore, the proposed scope of the policies to be updated, as well as the process and programme for undertaking the partial update. The key issues covered in comments in this regard can be briefly summarised as:

- Process of reviewing policies and selection of those to be updated needs to be clearer e.g. to ensure all policies accord with the current NPPF
- Need to ensure the climate emergency is fully addressed through the partial update and therefore, some additional policies need to be reviewed and updated now
- The plan period should be extended so that the updated Local Plan covers a period of at least 15-years from adoption, as required by the NPPF
- Related to this the housing requirement should be reviewed and the updated plan should be planning for a greater level of housing to reflect likely increased levels of need arising from the standard method and to help meet unmet needs arising in Bristol
- Insufficient evidence of the shortage of housing supply and the need to replenish it has been set out
- Some of the existing Placemaking Plan site allocations that are not shown for review should be included in the partial update to address site specific issues
- Scope of the partial update must include policies to facilitate addressing nature emergency e.g. relating to Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity Net Gain
- Support for the preparation programme but need to ensure communities and stakeholders are involved in the process taking account of Covid-19 restrictions

Options consultation (January – February 2021)

8 Introduction

- 8.1 The Options Document was agreed for consultation at [Council Cabinet meeting on the 10th of December 2020](#). The Options document and accompanying documents was published for consultation, in compliance with [Regulation 18 of the Local Plan Regulations](#), between the 7th of January and 18th of February 2021.
- 8.2 The Options document was presented as a discussion document, designed for community and stakeholder engagement and to generate discussion on the options outlined for addressing policies through the Partial Update. To aid the respondent a series of questions were included throughout the document, relating to the policy options presented.
- 8.3 The document was split into sections on which comments could be made:
- Development Management polices
 - Potential housing site allocations
 - Other allocations

- Schedule of minor amendments
- Other policy areas (opportunity for respondents to raise any issues not included within the plan)

9 Information on the Options consultation

Notification mailout – Pre consultation

- 9.1 Information advising of the forthcoming consultation was issued prior to the start of the consultation period by email/letter on 18th December 2020 to all those on the mailing list which included statutory consultees and a range of other stakeholders. The mailout included the dates of the consultation period and details of a webinar on the LPPU and getting involved (see paragraph 10.2 for further details).
- 9.2 The Parish and Town Councils were mailed separately with the same information.

Notification mailout – Start of consultation

- 9.3 Information about the consultation was issued at the start of the consultation period by email/letter on 7th January 2021 to all those on the mailing list which included statutory consultees and a range of other stakeholders. Whilst the mailout encouraged people to submit their comments electronically using the comment form provided, it was made clear that letters would also be accepted.
- 9.4 Again, Parish and Town Councils were mailed separately with the same information.

Press release and media coverage

- 9.5 Three press releases were issued between December 2020 and February 2021 advising of the Local Plan consultation and related. These were picked up in the local press including:

Local Press

- Bath Echo
- Bath Newseum
- Midsomer Norton Nub News

Comment Form

- 9.6 The Council produced a Comment Form in the form of a Citizenspace website for those who wished to respond to the consultation. It included clear information on how to respond using the form.

Dedicated webpage

- 9.7 A webpage relating to the consultation could be accessed via links from the main Planning Policy webpage and on the dedicated Local Plan webpage.
- 9.8 The webpage set out the following information:
- An overview of the purpose of the Local Plan Partial Update and the reasons why a review is being undertaken
 - Consultation Details: how to respond and links to the consultation material and supporting documents, including the comments form
 - An accessible HTML version of the Options document as well as a PDF version
 - Next steps following the consultation and other opportunities for users to get involved with planning policy, e.g. responding to the call for sites

Direct Contact Information

- 9.9 An email address was provided on all the consultation material, mail-outs, and website for those who wanted to ask direct questions and seek further information.
- 9.10 For respondents unable to comment electronically, written comments could be posted to the Council's mailing address.

10 Stakeholder engagement

- 10.1 Again, due to restrictions in place relating to COVID-19, no in-person public events or exhibitions were held alongside the publication of the Options document.

Webinars:

- 10.2 A series of Local Plan Partial Update webinars was held during the consultation period. These were promoted on the Local Plan website and via press releases. These were available for all stakeholders to attend and generally held on specific topics within the plan; with both Council Officers and Council Members on the Panel and with a "Q&A" session at the end.
- 10.3 The dates and topics of these are outlined below:

Date	Webinar Topic
21 December 2020	Getting Involved in Planning Policy – Local Plan Update
26 January 2021	Local Plan Update – Policy focus: HMOs
02 February 2021	Local Plan Update – Policy focus: Housing Supply
04 February 2021	Local Plan Update – Policy focus: Climate emergency (zero carbon/renewable energy)

- 10.4 All webinars were recorded and were made available to view on the [Council's YouTube channel](#)
- 10.5 In addition to webinars, Officers attended events and public meetings arranged by outside organisation to promote the consultation and discuss the presented. These included attendance at:
- [Bath and West Community Energy – Wind Power for Our Communities](#)

11 Representations on the Options document

- 11.1 During the consultation a total of around 2,390 representations were received. This represents a high level of response, especially given the context of the restrictions resulting from the covid-pandemic.
- 11.2 It should be noted, however, that around 1,600 of these representations (or more than 60%) were 'standard' e-mailed representations relating to the Bath Recreation Ground, resulting from Bath Rugby contacting their customer base. In addition, a further 217 responses (almost 10% of total representations) were received from Whitchurch residents in the form of a 'standard' (albeit sometimes modified) letter or email.
- 11.3 Setting aside the 'standard' representations referenced above around 560 responses were received. Around 70% of these were from individual residents and the remainder from a variety of organisations, including Parish & Town Councils, Planning Consultancies/Developers and non-government or voluntary organisations. The representations received related to all parts of the Plan.
- 11.4 Comments received during the Options Consultation can be [viewed online on the Council's consultation portal](#).

Summary of the main issues raised through the consultation

- 11.5 A summary of the wide range of issues that were raised is set out in **Annex 2**. Many of the comments related to specific sites or potential policy approaches/solutions. These will be useful in informing the next stages in the Local Plan process.
- 11.6 The Options Consultation analysis identified the following high-level key issues:

- Much support for buildings carbon reduction policies – including views that the council should enact the Future Homes Standards as soon as possible; fabric first should be used in retrofitting as well as new buildings; on site renewables are preferable to carbon offsetting; flexibility is needed to take account of technology advancements and differences in performance of non-residential buildings; and council needs to look at how it can facilitate appropriate zero carbon measures in listed buildings
- Concerns expressed (mainly by developers) around the viability of introducing zero carbon requirement and impact on affordable housing provision
- Electric Vehicles – most respondents favour requirement for passive charging as it is more flexible and enables benefits of technological advances to be realised
- Significant support for policy approach that seeks to achieve modal shift to sustainable modes of transport – however, improvements to walking/cycling infrastructure need to be matched by restrictions on car use, including parking controls, especially in Bath and in the rural areas need to improve the alternatives to the car
- Concept of Bath Spa University Locksbrook campus has attracted support especially if it also acts as a creative business hub as well as providing teaching space and it will enable more sustainable movement of students
- Range of comments on wind energy policy approach – broad support for increased renewable energy provision, but contrasting views on the acceptability or otherwise of landscape impact and concerns in terms of wildlife impact
- HMOs – significant agreement that more policy controls are needed to control the concentration of HMOs, more detailed analysis needed of views on different options
- The strategic housing requirement that is being planned for should be reviewed now - the LPPU should not be based on meeting the Core Strategy requirement which is out of date (given the Core Strategy was adopted 7 years ago) and the NPPF requires it to be reviewed and for the updated plan to cover a period of at least 15 years from adoption
- Acceptance of the strategy of focusing required housing provision on brownfield sites in the city. Important to ensure the LPPU sets out clear parameters for development to ensure benefits are realised (e.g. in terms of Twerton Park development helping to regenerate/improve Twerton centre) and that development is sensitive to its context (all sites, with many comments focussing on Sion Hill site)
- Significant concerns and objections to any further housing development adjoining Whitchurch village

- Focus for enabling increased job opportunities in Somer Valley supported and views that South Road Car Park should be retained for car parking to serve the town centre, if a food store is needed should consider Former Welton Packaging Factory site (subject to improved linkages to northern end of high street)

12 Next Stage

12.1 There will be further opportunities to comment on the content of the Local Plan Partial Update, as the update progresses towards becoming adopted. The table below outlines the proposed stages to adoption of the Local Plan Partial Update:

Date	Activity
6th of April and 1st of June 2020	Launch consultation (Commencement Document)
7th of January - 18th February 2021	Options Consultation
27th August– 8th October 2021	Publication Draft Consultation (Regulation 19)
Autumn 2021	Plan submission for examination by a planning inspector appointed by the Secretary of State (Regulation 21)
Winter 2021/22	Examination hearings
Spring 2022	Adoption

ANNEX 1: LOCAL PLAN PARTIAL UPDATE COMMENCEMENT CONSULTATION COMMENTS SUMMARY

Process and Programme

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL CONSIDERATION/RESPONSE
The programme is realistic though all efforts should be made to streamline the process without prejudicing the need to undertake full and proper consultation.	Agreed.
The Partial Review will need to be the subject of the Duty to Cooperate to consider any cross-boundary implications including how to meet Bristol's unmet housing needs and to prepare Statements of Common Ground.	The partial update will be subject to the Duty to Cooperate and Statements of Common Ground will be prepared as appropriate. The partial update will replenish housing supply to meet the Core Strategy requirement and in accordance with its spatial strategy.
The Partial Update is not appropriate. Local Plan full review is needed as evidence base for Core Strategy is out of date and there are significant changes in circumstances and national policies. Strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum fifteen-year period from adoption to anticipate and respond to long-term requirements and opportunities. The Core Strategy end date is 2028/29, which is only nine years away.	The partial update is needed in order to address some important issues in the short term. The update will ensure policies conform with NPPF 2019. The full review of the Local Plan will be undertaken within the context of and to deliver the WECA Spatial Development Strategy. The full review will address longer term issues, it will be progressed in a timely manner commencing later in 2021 (see Local Development Scheme).
Greater clarity needed around review process and the most appropriate solution (amending policies e.g. to ensure policies accord with current NPPF) or addressing implementation issues	Options document outlines the partial update/review process and ensures policies are updated to accord with current NPPF as soon as possible.
Following the West of England CA Strategic Development Strategy timetable, the Council should focus its efforts on working with its neighbours to collectively agree revised arrangements for future sub-regional planning in parallel with the preparation of a New Local Plan .	Agreed. In the mean time the partial update will address important issues in the shorter term.
Appears to be bureaucratic, complicated process and Covid-19 has meant residents have received inadequate notification of the consultation. People without internet access do not have a voice in the consultation process	Government has made it clear that plan-making must continue despite covid-19. Whilst consultation will necessarily need to focus on on-line engagement the Council will publicise the consultation widely and facilitate comments being submitted via other means where possible.
Clear consideration should be given to the content of made and emerging Neighbourhood Plans to avoid conflict between policies.	The Council will provide advice to parish & town councils as appropriate in order to ensure alignment of Neighbourhood Plans with the Local Plan partial update.

Scope and approach

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL CONSIDERATION/RESPONSE
<p>The scope of policies being updated should be broadened. The housing and employment requirements for the District should be reviewed to ensure that the Local Plan continues to plan for the most appropriate growth targets, particularly housing and workspace/jobs. As calculations of housing need in the Core Strategy pre-date the Standard Methodology, the figures need to be re-evaluated.</p>	<p>As this is a partial update of the Core Strategy and the Placemaking Plan reviewing the housing and job growth requirements is not appropriate and falls outside scope of the Plan. The partial update is limited to ensuring the policy framework supports the delivery of the Core Strategy housing and job growth/employment space requirements. Both the strategic housing and employment requirements will be reviewed through the WECA Spatial Development Strategy and new B&NES Local Plan.</p>
<p>Covid-19: There is a need for specific policies to address problems exacerbated by the effects on the economy and society of Covid-19 including the increase in migration to rural areas.</p>	<p>Consideration will be given to addressing some policies in order to help facilitate post covid-19 recovery. The longer-term impacts on rural migration will need to be evidenced and then addressed through the new Local Plan (full review) as appropriate.</p>
<p>Climate and Nature Emergency: Support the Partial Update addressing the climate and nature emergency but concerns these key issues cannot be addressed without reviewing the spatial strategy and other policies as well as the viability evidence.</p>	<p>Policies will be updated in order to help better address the climate and ecological emergencies. These policies will be viability tested alongside the other policies in the Local Plan.</p>
<p>Climate and Nature emergency should be at the core of all policies and as such more policies need to be included within the scope of the review e.g. design policies, GI and nature conservation policies.</p>	<p>The scope of policies included in the Local Plan Partial Update has been broadened to include the key policies that need to be updated to help address the climate and ecological emergencies.</p>
<p>Policies need to better encourage more renewable energy generation (geothermal, wind farms and solar farms) and implementation of a Council insulation scheme. Creation of more public green/allotment spaces with a new co-ordinated Nature Recovery network and delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain. Renewable energy projects need to be consistent with the AONB designations and management plans.</p>	<p>These issues will be addressed through the partial update as far as appropriate and will be supported by work on other Council projects e.g. Biodiversity Net Gain Supplementary Planning Document.</p>
<p>Climate Emergency will require a change of emphasis and attitude towards the quality and sustainability (carbon impact) of housing, the sustainability of transport, and local renewable energy generation including cross border collaboration for renewable energy.</p>	<p>The Local Plan Partial Update will emphasise moves to zero carbon development. Cross border collaboration on these issues will be progressed through the WECA Spatial Development Strategy.</p>
<p>Government's Future Homes Standard would set new requirements and there would be no purpose for local authorities to use planning policies to achieve the same outcome.</p>	<p>Implementation/adoption of Future Homes Standard has not yet been determined by the government. Local policy options are to be presented related to whether and how Future Standards are adopted.</p>

Policy and Site Issues

MAIN ISSUES RAISED	COUNCIL CONSIDERATION/RESPONSE
Housing: More housing should be facilitated to meet specific needs e.g. Including those of older people, affordable housing, high density co-living, micro housing and self-build, but needs to be based on robust evidence.	The partial update will seek to facilitate further provision of housing based on available evidence.
Green Belt encircling the urban areas cannot be addressed by partial, non-strategic reviews of individual development areas.	Should replenishing housing supply necessitate consideration of Green Belt sites the review of Green Belt and demonstration of the necessary exceptional circumstances will be undertaken in accordance with the NPPF.
Various support for and proposed new development sites including at North Keysham, Hicks Gate, Green Belt land around larger settlements and greenfield land in Somer Valley and rural areas (avoid having to remove land from the Green Belt).	Noted. Sites to be considered for allocation in accordance the spatial strategy set out in the Core Strategy.
Various objections to existing allocated sites which therefore need to be reviewed (e.g. Sulis Down, Bath Recreation Ground etc), as well as sites promoted by developers and HELAA sites (including over 100 representations regarding RAD25/26).	Noted. Existing site allocations will be reviewed to reflect current circumstances and in accordance with the current NPPF and the Core Strategy/Placemaking Plan policy framework.
New housing sites (if required) must be allocated in areas well served by sustainable means of transport – avoid rural locations reliant on the private car	New site allocations will be considered in accordance with the spatial strategy of the Core Strategy which seeks to focus development on locations well served by sustainable transport.
Need for viability testing to understand impact of zero carbon requirement e.g. it may require trade-offs in respect of other requirements/aspirations	Draft Plan (Reg 19) will be subject to viability testing.
Student accommodation: Mixed response - support for more purpose-built student accommodation (PBSA) to avoid further HMOs; no more HMOs and PBSAs in the city except on campuses (including removing the Bath Spa University Newton Park campus from the Green Belt). Alternatively the constraints of both campuses means that it is unrealistic to accommodate all PBSA on campus therefore more PBSA should be allowed in the city centre in Bath.	The policy approach to providing student accommodation will be reviewed and updated through the Local Plan partial update, including provision on the Universities' campuses.
Need to control short term lets. PBSA should not be used as short term lets .	The approach to short-term residential lets will need to be considered within the context of national legislation.
Support to revise Policy H2 (HMO) to include a change of use from small HMOs to large HMOs.	Noted. Policy options are presented in the options document.
A new policy about the usage of artificial and hybrid grass pitches in the authority	Noted. The options document sets out information on this issue within the context of the scope and requirements of the planning system.

<p>Parking polices should be revised quickly in line with the climate emergency and current applications should not be subject to outdated requirements (including new requirements for student accommodation, HMOs and co-living)</p>	<p>Parking standards are proposed to be reviewed and revised in line with the climate emergency through the preparation of a Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document in parallel with the Local Plan Partial Update.</p>
<p>Polices should prioritise reducing the need to travel.</p>	<p>Noted. This is an important aspect of helping to address the climate emergency and will be considered through the Local Plan Partial Update.</p>
<p>Greater development of public transport corridors and sustainable travel including walking and cycling. Car parking numbers in the centre of Bath should be reduced to discourage car travel pollution. Refer to the clean air zone. Rural transport issues must be included within the scope.</p>	<p>The sustainable transport policies are proposed to be revised through the partial update to place greater emphasis on sustainable transport modes. The partial update will need to reflect and work alongside other Council projects e.g. Liveable Neighbourhoods.</p>
<p>Should keep Covid19 reduced pollution levels by the removal of large HGVs (including the introduction of the weight limit over Cleveland Bridge) and through traffic, reduce significantly the health, safety and climate change threats that impact on the quality of life for B&NES residents.</p>	<p>Noted. The Local Plan Partial Update will need to support and work alongside other relevant Council projects addressing the impact of HGVs in the city and other transport impacts that affect quality of life.</p>
<p>Collaborate with Wiltshire and Dorset and Department of Transport to route traffic away from the current excessively used A46-A36 SRN route and A46-A4 going towards Bristol.</p>	<p>Work continues on this issue and will be reflected in and facilitated by the development of B&NES planning policy as appropriate (note that this is likely to fall outside the scope of the Local Plan Partial Update).</p>
<p>Other strategies and key projects should be referenced in the Local Plan such as the Green Infrastructure Strategy, Bath Riverline Project, Bathampton Meadows GI proposals etc</p>	<p>Agreed that relevant GI projects will be referenced and their delivery facilitated through the Local Plan Partial Update as appropriate (see Options document).</p>

Annex 2: Response to Local Plan Partial Update: Options consultation, Regulation 18

The schedule below summarises the key issues raised during the Options consultation under Regulation 18 and the Council’s response in preparing the pre-submission draft Local Plan Partial Update (to be subject to consultation under Reg 19). The issues are categorised by the Adopted Core Strategy/Placemaking Plan Policy because comments were received relating to a number of adopted policies not referenced or proposed for amendment in the Local Plan Partial Update Options document. Column 2 of the schedule sets out the Options Document reference number where relevant. (noted as MA for minor amendments discussed in the Options document)

Policy	Options Doc Ref	Key Issues	Response
District-Wide Volume			
General		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This Partial Update is a huge task and one that will take resources and distract from the much needed full review of the strategy. It is a legal requirement for all Local Plans to be reviewed at least every five years (2019 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Footnote 18) All development management policies and sites allocations should be reviewed. New plans should have a plan period of 15 years 	<p>The new Local Plan is already in preparation alongside the West of England Spatial Development Strategy. This is a partial update, rather than a new plan. Its scope is clearly set out in both the commencement and options documents and is confined to that which is necessary to meet key priorities and urgent issues.</p>
DW1 District-wide Spatial Strategy		<p>Housing requirement/land supply and allocation of alternative or additional sites for development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Local Plan should be based on reviewed and updated housing figures, covering a longer plan period (at least 15 years from adoption as required by the NPPF) and addressing unmet need from Bristol. There needs to be greater flexibility in supply. Others consider that the proposed approach in the Local Plan Partial Update leads to an over-supply of housing and that it should be based on meeting housing need derived from the national standard method Overall support for identifying and allocating sites to deliver supply shortfall but approach to identifying shortfall questioned Over reliance on Brownfield sites (need to consider the habitats and wildlife of brownfield sites) 	<p>This is a partial update of the Local Plan. Following review the housing requirement is not being amended. A new housing requirement for B&NES covering at least a 15-year period will be established through the WECA Spatial Development Strategy (SDS) and a new Local Plan for B&NES will be prepared to deliver this requirement. The partial update should not prejudice strategic decisions to be made in the SDS.</p> <p>There is considered to be sufficient flexibility both in the housing requirement established by the Core Strategy (greater than SHMA evidenced need) and in terms of supply to meet the Core Strategy</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any release of Green Belt land is not supported and would be inconsistent with national policy. • Bath is still most sustainable location and therefore sites within the Green Belt should be reviewed and allocated. • Uncertainty in terms of the delivery of the safeguarded land. • Small scale site allocations needed in the Somer Valley, • No sites should be allocated in Whitchurch and Chew Valley • Land at Hicks Gate/Brislington is promoted for development 	<p>requirement and to ensure the Housing Delivery Test can continue to be met. Whilst marginally more housing than the around 13,000 Core Strategy requirement will be provided, this does not materially change the strategy.</p> <p>The Core Strategy housing requirement continues to be used in the partial update and is not considered to be out of date as it is not below the standard method and circumstances have not materially changed.</p> <p>At the time of the Options document consultation about 1,200 homes were needed to meet the Core Strategy housing requirement (now the shortfall is 1,100 homes). Deliverable sites have been identified and allocated based on the Core Strategy approach of prioritising brownfield sites, focussing most development in Bath and then Keynsham as the next most sustainable location. This includes the land removed from the Green Belt in the Core Strategy and safeguarded for development. In line with the Core Strategy some limited development is also directed to sites in the Somer Valley.</p> <p>No additional greenfield sites are needed and there are not considered to be exceptional circumstances to release further land from the Green Belt in order to meet the Core Strategy housing requirement.</p>
CP1 Retrofitting existing buildings	DM3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fabric first approach should be used in retrofitting • Carbon reductions should be addressed in listed buildings • Support for EPC C certificates on HMOs – although this could be increased further in the next Local Plan 	<p>Many retrofitting measures are permitted development - it is not possible to specify 'fabric improvement' first approach on retrofitting works as works to the fabric may not be taking place. The</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The requirement of EPC C certificate will cause the cost to be passed onto the occupants • Where is the evidence for increasing the carbon reduction (over and above that set out in Sustainable Construction Checklist SPD i.e. to 20%)? 	<p>revised SPD will provide guidance on retrofitting.</p> <p>Energy Efficiency Retrofitting SPD is being reviewed and consulted alongside Draft LPPU which sets out positive guidance on how to retrofit energy efficiency measures to historic buildings appropriately.</p> <p>Retaining carbon reduction levels to those set out in the Sustainable Construction Checklist SPD is the Council's preferred approach.</p>
CP2 Sustainable construction	DM1 and DM2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall support for zero carbon policy approach, although some raise concerns as to whether the policy approach goes far enough • The council should enact the Future Homes Standards as soon as possible but concern as to how it can be transitioned into policy • Solar panels and renewable energy opportunities should be maximised • There should be provision for post construction performance monitoring • Non-residential buildings vary widely in performance and therefore the policy needs to be flexible • Policy also needs to be flexible to allow for technological advances (avoid being over prescriptive). • Future Homes Standards will achieve zero carbon with additional reduction through the grid decarbonisation. Therefore, there is no need for standards/local policy in addition to Building Regs. • Concerns that a zero carbon policy is not viable and that implementing it will affect the delivery of other policy objectives e.g. affordable housing • If offsetting is to be proposed then clarity will be needed on the offsetting fund arrangements and how the money will be spent 	<p>The proposed policy will prioritise energy needs to be met on site through renewable energy with a preference for solar. The energy metric of space heating and energy use intensity will not be prejudiced by the future homes standards and will achieve zero carbon construction. The policy will set standards for energy use intensity and space heating but will allow for a choice of technologies to be used.</p> <p>The future homes standards will not be introduced fully until 2025 and therefore a policy is being progressed to achieved zero carbon homes. The results of the future homes standards consultation in January confirmed that Local Authorities can set their own standards.</p> <p>Non-residential buildings will be required to be zero carbon but the policy is flexible as to how this is met, through fabric improvements and renewable energy. The policy has been viability tested and is considered as part of whole plan viability.</p>
New policy	DM4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for Whole Life Carbon assessments but need for 	<p>The policy (SCR8) will require an embodied carbon</p>

Whole Life Cycle Carbon assessment		guidance of how the policy would be implemented and must be subject to a viability assessment. Concerns that informing future plan-making is not sufficient justification for requiring a costly WLC assessment plus officers with the necessary technical expertise are needed to implement/understand the results. It is unclear as to what the repercussions would be of not complying with the policy.	assessment for sub structures, superstructures and finishes. A cost neutral approach has been taken whereby the target metric reflects current industry practice. Embodied carbon can be calculated using tools available online.
CP3 Renewable energy	DM5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the review of this policy in helping facilitate renewable energy and specifically the prohibition of new gas installations and focus on energy storage. • Renewable energy targets should be reviewed and made more ambitions 	Support for the policy approach noted, as well as the concerns raised. Comments regarding the targets are noted also; however, due to the scope of the Partial Update the renewable energy targets will not be updated/amended. This will done through the new Local Plan.
New Policy Emerging policy approach for harnessing wind energy	DM6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for adding policy wording to enable wind energy, although opposition voiced by some, for example ecological interests and sensitivities to wind energy development will be needed to complement the landscape evidence • Feedback received on the policy criteria and issues to pick up in policy wording in Reg 19 Plan e.g. for greater clarity around what is meant by 'community support' 	Support for the policy approach noted, as well as the concerns raised. The policy wording to be taken forward into the Draft Plan will seek to address these concerns, e.g. ecological interests and sensitivities to types of renewable energy development.
New Policy Harnessing wind energy (Options)	DM7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 2 was the most favoured approach however a number of responses supported Option 1. • Comments regarding the existing evidence being 10 years old/policy requires updated mapping • National Trust – support landscape character assessment approach • Comments that AONBs need greater consideration 	Accept that wind energy can be a polarising issue within communities. The Landscape evidence behind these options is currently being reviewed. The updated evidence will inform and be presented alongside the Draft Plan. Comments from the National Trust and AONB Boards are noted.
Electric vehicle infrastructure	DM8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for encouraging the provision of electric vehicle charging infrastructure, but concern around the network/grid capacity to deliver and impacts on development viability. Both 	The policy (SCR9) will require access to electric vehicle infrastructure. The required standards will be set through the Transport and Development

		options supported, although concerns that active chargers provided may become out of date quickly. Questions over the management of off-plot charging.	Supplementary Planning Document. The viability has been tested.
CP4 District heating	MA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that options document only appears to refer to District Heating proposal in Keynsham. • Need to think more broadly e.g. for Bath City one of the largest available heat sources is the River Avon. 	The policy is being modified to remove Keynsham High Street as a priority area as the majority of development sites in Keynsham High Street have been built out. Bath Central and Bath Riverside remain as priority areas.
CP5 Flood risk management	MA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Environment Agency welcome reference to Green Infrastructure, but concerned there is no explicit reference to natural flood management and working with natural processes. This can be part of the solution to minimising flood risk in a catchment and providing other environmental benefits such as reducing agricultural run-off to rivers and increase biodiversity and its abundance. All of these contribute to taking a natural capital approach. • Broadening of the purpose required for the flood risk management approach to include Green Infrastructure benefits is welcomed. • Amend policy CP5 to note that FRAs can steer GI through development to benefit flood risk. 	<p>Policy NE1(Development and Green Infrastructure) and CP7 (Green Infrastructure) are amended to emphasise the use of nature based solutions.</p> <p>The risk based sequential approach is taken to select new development sites.</p> <p>Policy CP5 will be reviewed through the new Local Plan.</p>
SU1 Sustainable drainage	MA	<p>Comments from the Environment Agency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally supportive of the use of SuDs, they must be designed and managed in such a way so as to prevent deterioration in groundwater quality. The policy should be updated to reflect this. • Welcome the broadening of purpose required of SUDs, moving from traditional drainage engineering function to include Green Infrastructure benefits. • Current SPD that supports Policy SU1 is very dated and includes little technical guidance on goals for biodiversity gain. It would therefore be helpful to include reference within supporting text to 	Policy SU1 will be fully reviewed through the new Local Plan and the new Biodiversity Net Gain SPD in preparation will also be relevant.

		<p>amended policy SU1 to how to integrate nature-based solutions, ecological gain and Green Infrastructure within SUDS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to include mechanisms for monitoring the effectiveness of SUDS development delivery. 	
CP6 Environmental quality	MA	<p>Comments from the Environment Agency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is expected that the requirement for development to enhance and prevent any further deterioration of groundwater will be managed via consultations as part of the development management process, when more detailed information will be made available for review. • As part of planning process, the Environment Agency expects any prospective developer to undertake a suitable assessment of the risks posed to groundwater and that this information is submitted in support of any application. Where such information is not provided, the Environment Agency will utilise planning conditions and objections to ensure our requirements for groundwater protection are met in accordance with national planning policy. • In areas of high groundwater sensitivity (i.e. SPZ, Principal Aquifers) and where historic land uses have included highly contaminative uses or where schemes are complex in nature or larger scale, the Environment Agency recommends that developers seek early engagement with the Agency. • Any development near a watercourse should seek to maximise opportunities to improve the water environment and work towards Good Ecological Status under the Water Framework Directive. The waterbodies in the areas earmarked for development are failing for fish, phosphate and macrophytes and phytobenthos. The reasons for the failures are attributed to waste water treatment inputs, agricultural inputs and physical modification of the channel. • The SPD on biodiversity net gain should: include a presumption in favour of development which safeguards and enhances natural assets and GI networks across the District; commit B&NES Council to proactively work with partners in the development of a new co- 	<p>Comments on planning/Development Management process noted. Comments relating to the Biodiversity Net Gain SPD will be considered as part of its preparation.</p>

		<p>ordinated Ecological Networks Map (Nature Recovery Network) for the District that covers at least 30% of its terrestrial environment; note the intention that the new network will be adopted and implemented throughout West of England and other adjacent authorities Development Plans and LEP Plans; include clear technical guidance for developers, their agents and parish and town councils on best practice to safeguard and enhance ecological networks through the development process.</p>	
D1 General urban design principles		<p>As a matter of priority the potential proliferation of over-development, in the form of rear extensions (beyond the ‘original rear building line’) in the Avenues within the Bear Flat Conservation Area must be addressed. This is of significant community interest and will impact on cohesion within this Conservation Area, within a World Heritage City.</p>	<p>Noted – this falls outside the scope of the LPPU. The most appropriate means to addressing this issue will be considered by the Council.</p>
D4 Streets and Spaces		<p>The explicit requirement to line new streets with trees welcomed. Every reasonable effort must be made by developers to reduce technical constraints to tree planting in new streets and green spaces to an absolute minimum.</p>	<p>Noted. To be considered further through the new Local Plan.</p>
PMP:D7 Infill & backland development		<p>Definition of back-land development should be amended.</p>	<p>This can be reviewed through the new Local Plan.</p>
D8 Lighting	MA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for policy amendments and the focus on protecting wildlife habitats. It should link with other B&NES polices such as the Dark Skies policy. There is increasing evidence of the adverse impacts of light pollution on our health and environment. • The area around ancient woodland etc should also be protected and an inventory of trees should be created to place trees under protection and develop a lighting plan as appropriate. • The policy needs to take into account recent evidence around the harm of blue rich lights and there should also be monitoring to assessed effectiveness of policy. • Policy should be amended taking account increasing recent evidence of the harms caused by blue rich artificial lighting to eco- 	<p>Comments noted. Further review will take place through the new Local Plan.</p> <p>Policy D8 is updated in the LPPU referring to the guidance including B&NES 2018 Waterspace Design Guidance and Bats and Lighting in the UK (ILP, 2018).</p>

		<p>systems and human health.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy should incorporate key aspects of the Cotswold AONB Management Plan policy on dark skies (CE6). 	
NE2 Conserving and enhancing the landscape and landscape character	MA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the updating of the policy in line with the NPPF. However, note that the NPPF (at paragraph 172) doesn't reference the setting of the AONB, but relates to land within it. This should be corrected in the draft policy. • The Mendip Hills AONB Partnership welcome and support addition of section 4 to NE2. However, we consider that the AONBs should have a standalone policy. 	<p>Noted. The setting of the AONB is not included in the revised Policy NE2.</p> <p>Comments noted. Further review will take place through the new Local Plan.</p>
NE2A Landscapes setting of settlements		NE2A – Maes Knoll and its landscape setting should be protected.	Comments noted. Further review will take place through the new Local Plan.
NE3 Sites, species and habitats	DM9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England Broadly support the proposed changes to this policy, which will be positive for wildlife, including the proposed protection for irreplaceable habitats. However, consider that it could more clearly reflect the hierarchy of protection afforded to nature conservation sites and species. In our view, it may be clearer to present the policy along the following lines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International and European sites (SPA, SAC, Ramsar) – (And European protected species) • SSSIs, NNRs • Local Sites and local nature reserves • Irreplaceable Habitats, which may or may not be present on or associated with the above • Priority Habitats • NE also request clarification of what would be considered irreplaceable and the intention of point 2, which refers to exceptional circumstances where development that adversely impacts on national and international designated sites will be permitted. It is NE's understanding that development likely to result in adverse effects on the integrity of European designated sites or 	<p>The proposed policy in the pre-submission Draft Plan closely reflects the NPPF, including the hierarchy of protection afforded to nature conservation sites and species, and greater clarity on policy terminology is also addressed in the supporting text and the glossary. The proposed policy approach has been discussed with Natural England.</p> <p>Policy requiring Biodiversity Net Gain is retained in the pre-submission draft in order to help address the Council's Ecological Emergency declaration.</p>

		<p>Ramsar sites should not be permitted by a local planning authority, and that it would be for the New Office for Environmental Protection to determine such cases.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be useful if the supporting text provided some explanation of what is meant by irreplaceable habitat. The NPPF refers to ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees as examples of irreplaceable habitat. However, irreplaceable habitat is not necessarily limited to these specific examples. • NE support the requirement for Biodiversity Net Gain to be managed in perpetuity. This is because many priority habitats, such as lowland calcareous grassland, take many years – or even decades - to become well established. <p>Other consultees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define 'no alternative solution'. Biodiversity loss is not in the public interest and should not be trumped by development. Habitats cannot be quickly and artificially created. • The reference to veteran trees in para 1 downgrades their protection (as set out in NPPF para 175c). • Every new build and extension should also make use of nesting bricks and other wildlife measures. • The wording is too restrictive so that in certain areas it will prove difficult to address during the planning process, potentially jeopardising otherwise demonstrably sustainable and deliverable sites. • An Ecological Emergency has been declared by the Council. The approval by B&NES planning committee for a development on a site containing a rare TUFA spring is an instant fail against its own policy (e.g. Englishcombe Lane) • Phrase “Development that would adversely affect, directly or indirectly irreplaceable habitats, will not be permitted” should be amended so that it accurately reflects NPPF, para 15 c. • The Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats Technical Guidance, is shortly 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>to be updated. Somerset CC ask that the local plan references this document in relation to the Special Area of Conservation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post construction monitoring should be made compulsory • Consideration should be given in respect of developers just using fencing to border gardens, hedging should be the preferred option to encourage biodiversity. • Would be helpful if BNG SPD includes guidance on how sites, species and habitats policy can be coordinated in the context of practical development, with supporting biodiversity links across the wider countryside 	
NE5 Ecological networks	DM10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England supports the policy changes and welcomes the commitment to reflect nature recovery networks on the Policies Map. Understanding the importance of ecological assets and habitat networks across the district and how to best protect and enhance or expand those will provide an important tool for meeting policy aims relating to the ecological and climate emergencies, biodiversity net gain, and landscape, as well as broader policy for sustainable development. • The Cotswolds Conservation Board and Mendip Hills AONB Partnership also support the explicit reference to Nature Recovery Networks, as this reflects emerging national policy and legislation. Also links to AONB Nature Recovery Strategies. • Planned ecological corridors and dark corridors of the city must coincide and preferably have a water content. Hedgerows demand upgraded protection and a programme of reinforcement. • Council should adopt a system for sustainability assessments of planning developments such as BREEAM and Green Space Factor, (GSF). • The council should ensure that a legal basis exists for ensuring maintenance and improvement of new development green spaces after project completion (i.e. managed in perpetuity) and that seeking 10% or 15% Biodiversity Net Gain is supported by appropriate legal agreements. 	Proposed policy set out in the pre-submission draft plan reflects national policy and has been discussed with Natural England.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With reference to plan policy NE5 and plan policy NE3 (4iii) for limiting artificial lighting, specific referenced areas need to be identified and protected as they form part of a coherent ecological network which is of significance to the city (and could play an important role in delivering BNG). The area includes the water area of Widcombe top lock wind on the K&A canal, and to its east, Horseshoe Copse, and Smallcombe containing the Bathwick cemeteries abutting National Trust lands on each side. The adjacent land area to the east of the water area identified above is also largely undeveloped supporting a range of fauna and flora. The area is contiguous with National Trust lands of Bathwick Hill proper leading up to the Skyline walk, and is consistent with the plan’s objective for ecological networks. 	
DM11 Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)	New Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were numerous responses to the Options Consultation for a new policy for Biodiversity Net Gain. These included strong support from predominantly members of the public and environmental organisations for Option 2 requiring BNG of 15% from development. Some responses suggested a higher BNG requirement. Similarly, there was clear support from mainly developers that BNG requirements should be in line with the requirement of the Environment Bill (BNG of 10%) and objected to Option 2 requiring a ‘Biodiversity Net Gain of 15%.’ • Developers further set out that there was no justification for 15% BNG and that local specific evidence to demonstrate a higher BNG than the Environment Bill of 10% had not been provided. A further developer highlighted that a 15% BNG requirement would create a serious issue with the deliverability and availability of housing land. • A number of comments highlighted that it would be more appropriate for the new Local Plan to consider BNG once the Environment Bill is finalised. Additional comments suggested that a BNG requirement be in accordance with national standards, with any gain beyond that being supported and encouraged rather than 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>New Policy NE3a requires major developments to include the Biodiversity Net Gain of at least 10% secured in perpetuity (at least 30 years). It is proposed to take forward a requirement of 15% BNG within the full Local Plan Review.</p> <p>Prior to the mandatory BNG requirements coming into effect the Council’s BNG policy will reflect the proposed mandatory measures, including use of the DEFRA metrics and emerging national guidance.</p> <p>The viability assessment was undertaken. The new BNG Supplementary Planning Document would set out local requirements for delivering biodiversity net gain and opportunities to deliver BNG on householder and exempted brownfield sites.</p>

		<p>required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of comments highlighted that any additional BNG requirements beyond the proposed Environment Bill requirement should be robustly viability tested and that proposed BNG requirements should also consider wider Local Plan and LPPU planning obligation requirements. • Across the board, a number of parties highlighted the need for clear technical guidance for developers, their agents and communities on BNG requirements. 	
NE6 Trees and woodland conservation	MA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor amendments to NE6 welcomed and brings into line with NPPF. However, in addition, recommended that the council includes an ambition to reach 30% tree canopy cover across all new developments; that new trees should be sourced & grown in the UK, or be sourced from nurseries with sound biosecurity measures, to help avoid the spread of disease; and that new trees are ecologically appropriate to the site and support nature recovery aims, and a diversity of species are planted. • Given the importance of hedgerows to nature recovery and habitat connectivity at landscape scale, and the devastating impact of Ash Dieback on landscape and ecology, policy should also include measures to specifically safeguard hedgerow trees of ecological importance if they are not ancient/veteran. • Recent developments which are visibly prominent on the skyline of Bath have demonstrated the need for this policy and its application to be more urgently reviewed. 	<p>Policy NE6 is amended to protect veteran trees.</p> <p>This will be reviewed fully through the new Local Plan.</p>
CP7 Green infrastructure	DM12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong support for acknowledging the importance of green infrastructure, nature recovery networks and biodiversity considerations in Green Infrastructure. • Amendments should reflect 'green and blue space'. • Comment relating to the Bath River Line included that part of the route had been compromised; green corridors should not be an excuse for commercial development (to help pay for delivery); the wider opportunities for the Bath River Line beyond Bath; and that 	<p>Policy CP7 already includes a strong policy framework in respect of Green Infrastructure, the natural environment and active travel. However, in order to help ensure policies better reflect the climate and ecological emergency and that links between Green Infrastructure and the health agenda are strengthened amendments are proposed. In the delivery section of the revised Policy CP7 includes the</p>

		<p>consideration should be given to services access and management.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need for strategic urban cycle routes between the South and East of the city and the city centre equal to the current level of provision from the West. • The Council should be conscious of this objective in its other planning policies by promoting locations for development which provide good opportunities to maximise green infrastructure networks to support active travel, walking and cycling for commuting and informal recreation thereby supporting healthy communities. • Wessex Water have assets and proposed changes need to consider underground services and access for maintenance. • Natural England supports and welcomes Council’s commitment to include other strategic nature recovery projects on the policies maps for new local plan – essential to provide clarity to developments and investment planning. Importance of managing recreation in relation to designated sites. 	<p>reference to the Bath River Line.</p>
<p>NE1 Development and green infrastructure</p>	<p>DM13</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitably qualified and/or experienced ecologist should be involved in drafting GI schemes and priority given to enhancement and creation of linear habitats based on ecological assessments. • Propose specific policy to protect Urban Green Spaces. ‘Greenprint for Bath’ supports eco-tourism and reduce pollution. • Amendments to policy NE1 which would improve contributions to the Green Infrastructure network would be welcome. • The opportunity for ubiquity makes Green infrastructure one of the most significant enhancements to the urban environment. Upgrading or linking abandoned plots, strips and corners, enriches the city environment at low cost and usually to universal support. • Covid pandemic brought change in attitudes and reactions in the way people live their lives and appreciation of Green Spaces - great social, wellbeing and economic value and should change the way we value them - they are valuable assets in their own right. • Opportunity to monetise our ecological credentials by establishing 	<p>Policy NE1 supports Policy CP7 by setting out the clear requirements of new development in relation to respecting/enhancing existing Green Infrastructure networks and providing additional Green Infrastructure. This policy is proposed to be amended to ensure the creation of new Green Infrastructure, where possible, links to active travel routes. It is also proposed to update text to Policy NE1 to reflect the benefits a healthy natural environment can provide not only to healthy lifestyles, but also in providing nature based climate change solutions.</p>

		<p>the City and surrounds as a destination for eco-tourism as well. Greening the city reduce air pollution but will increase the attractiveness of the City to visitors and residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed updates to Policy NE1 should be clarified to ensure that the policy is deliverable in practice. The requirement for all major development proposals to be accompanied by a proposed network of GI 'that can be used for walking and cycling and other forms of formal or informal physical activity' may not be practical or, indeed, desirable in the context of some major development sites and development proposals. • The Mendip Hills AONB Partnership consider that reference should be made to West of England' Nature Partnership's Nature recovery networks and B-Lines zones in the policy preamble. • Please also see comments for Policy CP7. 	
CP8 Green Belt		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPPF states that Green Belt should not be used to merely meet housing numbers. • Farmers and commercial growers should be allowed to extend their growing season by using greenhouses and polytunnels in the Green Belt. Without poly tunnels we cannot grow the range of vegetables and fruit that consumers need. • The Green Belt would be even greener if ecological farmers and growers could be supported in their installation and supported to restore degraded habitats (hedges, woodlands, ponds, soils). The Green Belt would be a vibrant and connected web of productive and wildlife enhancing agro-ecosystems. 	Policy CP8 is still considered to accord with the NPPF. Inappropriate development (as defined in the NPPF) will need to be justified by very special circumstances at the planning application stage. The policy will be reviewed in the new Local Plan.
GB2 Development in Green Belt villages	DM36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Options 1 is preferred - this is a sound proposal, sensibly increasing the importance of local knowledge and opinion to everyone's benefit. If Option 1 is taken forward this should also be subject to a review of the housing development boundaries. • Policy must be robustly worded to align to national policy. • Telecoms masts, new development on the fringes of the city and 	Comments noted. Option 1 to be taken forward for consideration for the Publication (pre-submission) Draft Plan.

		<p>other structures should be carefully considered and consistent approaches and safeguards should be set out in local policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure (especially telecoms masts) needs to be considered as a whole as per approach of other local authorities. 	
GB3 Extensions and alterations to buildings in the Green Belt		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In respect of a building's volume increase the plan's approach needs to be improved. The present volume increase guidance works in favour of larger properties, but not when considering extensions and alterations for smaller older properties. Volume increase approach utilising a 'sliding scale' pro rata to the property size should be used. 	This policy to be reviewed in the new Local Plan.
PCS1 Pollution and nuisance	DM14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendments that strengthen the policy would be welcome where there might be a mixed commercial / residential development - the Wheelers Yard in Timsbury is an example. • In respect of the policy wording, it would be difficult to establish whether 'potential sources' of pollution or nuisance arise from neighbouring land uses or from a development proposal itself. Therefore, greater clarity should be provided in respect of the policy wording. 	Review policy in the new Local Plan.
PCS3 Air quality		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air Quality improvements are only achievable if traffic is reduced not increased by building new roads • Better reporting of real time air quality is needed, annual averages are misleading 	Policy to be reviewed in new Local Plan.
PCS5 Contamination	DM15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sports England states that 3G artificial grass pitches have a number of benefits (durable, safe, weather resilient) so more people can benefit from them. Sports England have monitored safety issues which have reported a very low/negligible level of concern to human health. Sports England and leading sport governing bodies all support approach and will continue to provide reassurance that pitches are safe. 	Noted.
PCS6 Unstable land	DM16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is noted that the unstable land policy (PCS6) is proposed to be 	Noted.

		retained with no amendments. The Coal Authority has reviewed and has no specific comments to make.	
PCS8 Bath hot springs		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PCS8 "seeks to ensure that both the quality and quantity of the groundwater sources is protected from any development that is likely to have ANY adverse effect on this resource." This leads to unequivocal wording "Development that has any adverse impact on the quality or yield of the Bath Hot Springs will not be permitted". This wording should be extended to sites which have specific nature designations, including Sites of Nature Conservation Interest. 	Noted and will be considered in the new Local Plan.
CP9 Affordable housing	DM17 (Build to Rent)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some support for this policy given rental levels achieved in Build for Rent schemes especially in Bath. General and significant concern that the 30% rental discount level is difficult to achieve in Bath and is not compliant with NPPF. A more flexible approach may be required. No evidence to support the proposed rental discount level, a viability and housing assessment are needed in order to justify. Using the same discount as per the governments proposed First Homes Scheme is not enough justification. Priority needs to be given to residents already in B&NES and to key workers, with a focus on new homes. The policy needs clarification on rent relief. 	Comments noted. Build for Rent Policy not pursued in the Reg 19 pre-submission draft plan.
H2 Houses in multiple occupation and new policy H2A Intensification of existing HMOs	DM18 – DM20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support for proposed amendments to policy H2. New intensification policy should include assessment against concentration threshold tests. Intensification policy should reference commitment to enforcement action and time limit for which number of occupants cannot be increased. Council needs to try and rebalance areas that already exceed permitted HMO density. Requirement for 'good standard accommodation' needs 	Policy H2 has been updated to broaden the scope of applications tested using the concentration test, including applications for intensification. Policy requirements also include the need for a good standard of accommodation, and for all new HMOs to meet EPC C.

		<p>criteria/definition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better quality HMOs required for non-student occupiers. • General support for EPC C requirement. Some concern that costs will be passed to tenants. • More should be done to protect family-sized homes / homes for specific groups in need. • Proposed should be a Council tax holiday for developers returning HMOs to C3 use. • Policy distinction required between student and non-student HMOs. • Lack of rented housing for young professionals. New build HMO and extension of HMOs can help single working professionals who can't afford to rent their own home. • Residential street car parking permits should be made available only to Council Tax payers. 	
New Policy H2B: PBSA	DM 21 - 24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority of responses welcome restrictions on PBSA with focus on on-campus developments. However, two comments on behalf of PBSA developers strongly disagree with proposed need assessment policy (see last 3 bullets). • No evidence that PBSA can help to release HMOs back into C3 use. • In general, it is considered that PBSA should be included in HMO concentration test, though some parties highlight that managed PBSA developments are distinctly different from uncontrolled HMOs and should not therefore be included. • Allowing PBSA elsewhere where need is demonstrated is not considered appropriate. • Off-campus PBSA should only be built if 'need' exists AND corresponding number of PBSA bed spaces has previously been built on that establishment's campus. • Should be constraints on developers turning existing PBSA into uses such as hotels etc if it cannot be filled. Policy should require such developments to turn into housing or industrial units. • Calculations to work out student vs general population in Bath 	<p>PBSA development to be directed to on-campus locations, except where a need is demonstrated via a nomination agreement between developer and education facility. This is considered to be an appropriate control, which allows PBSA city-wide where a need is demonstrated, whilst ensuring that development sites are developed for general housing stock and employment floorspace in line with the overarching strategy of the Local Plan.</p> <p>PBSA will not be included within the HMO concentration calculation test.</p>

		<p>required, with target milestones to address current imbalance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England - potential benefits of directing PBSA to university sites, but essential that new development takes account of landscape and ecological sensitivities. • Proposed local approach, which seeks to prioritise other forms of housing over PBSA, is in direct conflict with national planning policy and is therefore unsound. • Requiring a campus first approach, followed by a needs-based approach, would give total control to the universities over the delivery of PBSA, which is wholly unacceptable given the significant commercial interests in private sector PBSA delivery that has become established over recent years. • Managed PBSA developments are distinctly different from uncontrolled HMO's 	
H4 Self-build		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Plan Partial Update should include updated policy on self-build and custom build housing, taking a more active approach to facilitating self-build development in the area. Currently a gap in policy. 	To be addressed in the new Local Plan.
H7 Housing accessibility	DM25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for proposed policy approach, including support for caveated approach to site specific factors in the implementation of accessibility standards. • Important to 'future-proof' new homes so adaptations can be made where necessary. • Noted that Council is seeking to apply M4(3) standards to all new housing. PPG only requires this for dwellings over which the Council has nomination rights. • How will data regarding need be captured? • Credible and robust evidence required, as well as District-wide viability testing (viability varies across the Council area). • Relevance of Government consultation 'Raising Accessibility Standards for New Homes' highlighted • Policy unnecessary as it duplicates proposed changes to Part M of 	<p>Policy proposed in the pre-submission draft plan accords with national policy/guidance (NPPG) and is supported by the latest evidence on housing need. Support is noted for caveated approach to site specific factors and in terms of future proofing new homes.</p> <p>Accessibility standards will be viability tested taking into consideration varying viability across the Council area.</p>

		the Building Regulations	
LR6A Local green spaces		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The retention of existing policy LCR6A for open space unchanged, will be unacceptable in the light of the plan's objectives for 2030 and more so for 2050, and it is unclear how Green Infrastructure policy G1 (amendments to CP7 & NE1) relates to this. Amendments to policy CP7 (pp24) for the Bath River Line appear insufficiently ambitious in the light of plan objectives for 2030, yet in terms of the Climate and Ecological crisis it is a strategic structuring of the city. The Avon re-greening has been discussed by Councils for many years, but other than the north quays project, with very little application. B&NES should be seen to be taking advantage of the commitment to plant 11m trees in the life of this Government without waiting for submission of the Plan for examination under Reg 21, far less waiting for its 	Local Green Spaces will be reviewed as part of the new Local Plan.
LCR9 Increasing the provision of local food growing		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the issue of food security is becoming even more pressing, and the climate /ecological emergencies, LCR9 should be amended specifically to encourage small producers such as market gardeners using polytunnels and greenhouses. 	Policy to be reviewed through the new Local Plan.
ED1B Change of use & redevelopment of B1(a) office to residential use		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy ED1B is currently far too "Bath centric" in categorising the economic reasons which would remove the presumption of permitted development / change of use to residential. B&NES Case Officers have been inconsistent in applying policy ED1B, and policy BF2 of the Chew Valley Neighbourhood Plan. All existing businesses and commercial premises are vital in rural areas as there are so very few. 	Comments noted. It should be noted that the change of use of offices (Class E Commercial and Business use class which also includes other commercial uses including retail and light industrial) to residential use is permitted development subject to prior approval and other conditions under Class MA of the General Permitted Development Order. This does not apply to Listed Buildings or buildings within a designated area including World Heritage Site (WHS) and AONBs . The policy will be reviewed as part of the new Local Plan.
ED2A Strategic (*) and other primary industrial estates (DM26)	DM26	Objections from specific premises/sites owners relating to their potential designation under Policy ED2A (see individual objections for detail):	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>No designation of the Wansdyke Business Centre and Polamco is proposed under Policy ED2A in the pre-</p>

		<p>Wansdyke Business Centre Land owner objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In summary the site is severely limited as an industrial site, due to poor access, proximity to local residents and size, as well as current condition of the property and external areas which make the site unviable as a good-quality industrial site. <p>Polamco landowner objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In summary the site is within a retail area and a more flexible approach should be pursued, also given the close relationship with the Locksbrook area which is undergoing a transformation, including potential creative industry hub (with Bath Spa University). Any new additions to the Locksbrook ‘Campus’ of BSU should not cause a loss to industrial and warehouse space in the Strategic Industrial Estates identified in policy ED.2A. <p>Other issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some support to allocate further sites under Policy ED2A and/or to enable their expansion where it would meet a demonstrable need for employment space that cannot reasonably met elsewhere in the existing estate/site (subject also to other criteria). Extension to Westfield Industrial Estate specifically supported. 	<p>submission draft plan.</p>
<p>ED2B non-strategic industrial sites</p>	<p>DM27</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong objection to approach set out – should not be protecting every single industrial/storage property. The new policy is diametrically opposed to the national policy which aims to provide more flexibility. The past growth is largely based on redevelopment of industrial land, the blanket policy to protect the industrial land would be going backwards. The proposed changes are considered unnecessary and counter-productive. Policy ED2A already provides substantial protection for the primary employment sites and sites considered to be of strategic importance. The changes proposed to Policy ED2B, with the listed criteria, would be more restrictive than Policy ED2A. 	<p>The significant losses of industrial land (especially within Bath) over and above those planned for in the Core Strategy, alongside ongoing demand for industrial premises, justify protection for such sites under a strengthened Policy ED2B. The proposed approach accords with national policy and enables considerations around the productive use for employment purposes of the site to be taken into account.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites which are in existing employment use may not be particularly productive or contribute in any meaningful way to the overall supply of employment. Sites in existing industrial use may in fact have negative aspects which would make alternative uses more appropriate. Each site should be judged on its own merits in terms of its present use and its suitability and viability of continuing those uses measured against other uses which may provide additional benefits. • B&NES Case Officers have been inconsistent in applying policy ED1B and ED2B of the Placemaking Plan and policy BF2 of the Chew Valley Neighbourhood Plan. All existing business and commercial premises are vital in rural areas and especially the Chew Valley because there are so very few. Such premises maintain the communities and bring at least some local employment. • Would prefer to see a clear presumption against conversion of business premises to residential in the Chew Valley (and indeed other rural areas). 	
Bath Spa University Policy approach	DM28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong support to develop the Locksbrook Road area as a creative business hub, maximising the benefit of collaboration with Bath Spa University's new Arts School development. Scope for innovation to retain graduates. • Pressure of walking and cycling needs to be taken off the river footpath. • Support for Locksbrook development and Sion Hill, however this should not decrease the industrial or warehouse space available. On balance the development would increase future employment, but the remaining employment land must be protected and BSU should not use more space as campus. • Any additional student accommodation not supported. • Further student accommodation is not supported. • Any new additions to the Locksbrook 'Campus' of BSU should not cause a loss to industrial and warehouse space in the Strategic 	Comments noted. The draft Plan proposes to allocate the Locksbrook Creative Industry Hub. Allocation of the Weston Island will help improve the walking and cycling.

		Industrial Estates identified in policy ED.2A.	
RE1 Employment uses in the countryside		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is not enough policy support for farm buildings, poly tunnels, horticulture and low-impact developments. Currently the local plan does not support small scale farming or organic horticulture, in fact it is a direct barrier to sustainable localised farming. 	Noted. To be considered through the new Local Plan.
RE2 Agricultural development		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There must be amendments to allow for sustainable small scale farming to return Bath to a resilient local food economy. There is currently a lack of support for agroforestry, organic horticulture, use of poly tunnels (to extend growing season and protect crops) and low impact farm infrastructure developments. Unlock the full potential of climate crisis adaptation and enhance the resilience of BANES residents a stronger focus needs to be put on regenerative farming, food system, health and landscape restoration. Allow new entrant farmers to build eco-construction for the purpose of their business (e.g. barn to store tools and materials, packing shed to assemble veg boxes, cool room to store fresh produce). The regulations in place especially in the Green Belt and AONB are outdated and do not allow the rapid response measures we need in times of emergency to produce food for local communities and restore vital life supporting systems. 	This falls outside the scope of the partial update. Agricultural development policy approach (including in relation the Green Belt/AONB) needs to be reviewed comprehensively through the new Local Plan.
RE4 Essential dwellings for rural workers		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to ease planning policies for rural workers, farmers, growers and foresters who work extremely hard and have to pay rent in rural or urban accommodation and commute to their work place, sometimes having to work 2 or 3 jobs at the same time. It is paramount that we allow to some degree and within reason (e.g. natural construction, low impact dwellings) farmers to live on their farm, as stewards of the land, who needs to be close to the land to take care of it. Temporary and permanent dwellings should be allowed to each farming business/family that can prove the ecological function and community service of his/her business. 	Comments noted. See response above Policy RE2. The current policy approach is in line with national policy on rural workers dwellings.
CR1 Sequential test		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Important that the Council carefully consider the existing retail offer 	This falls outside the scope of the Local Plan Partial

		of particular towns, and the need to provide additional provision to meet the ever-changing demands of the existing and future residents of BANES, and the retail market, especially what particular retailers can bring to the local authority area.	Update. Retail requirements (in the context of updated evidence, reflecting assessment of changed circumstances/recent trends) will be reviewed in the new Local Plan.
CR3 Primary shopping areas and primary shopping frontages		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important for the council to consider the existing retail offer of particular towns and the need to provide additional provision to meet the changing demands. It is important to consider what particular retailers can bring to the local area, such as Aldi who offer significant choice of locally sources products 	See response to Policy CR1 above.
CR4 Dispersed local shops		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smaller local centres that have declined and do not fulfil an essential retail convenience shopping function, such as the Lansdown Local Centre, should be undesignated. 	The identification of and policy approach towards small local centres in the hierarchy will be reviewed comprehensively in the new Local Plan (based on updated evidence and reflecting the use class changes).
ST1 Promoting sustainable travel	DM29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various specific suggestions for transport measures to be introduced, or for amendments to the transport network. • Concern that overly rigid wording or application of policy could preclude development in some instances, particularly rural settings. • Concern that wording of policies require a higher standard of sustainable transport provision than the NPPF and are therefore contrary to national policy. 	Suggestions are more appropriate for transport plans, such as future Joint Local Transport Plans. Regarding concern over rigid wording, there is flexibility within both local and national policy to be location-specific in application. Standard of sustainable transport provision is within the context of the planning framework.
ST2 Sustainable transport routes	DM30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please see comments received for other transport related options. 	
ST2A Recreational routes	DM31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please see comments received for other transport related options. 	
ST3 Transport infrastructure	DM32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various specific suggestions for transport measures to be introduced, or for amendments to the transport network. Disability terminology queried. 	Suggestions noted but are more appropriate for transport plans, such as future Joint Local Transport Plans. Terminology relating to disabled people amended.
ST5 Traffic	DM33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various specific suggestions for transport measures to be 	Suggestions noted but are more appropriate for

management proposals		<p>introduced, or for amendments to the transport network.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disability terminology queried. • Various comments made, both for and against, regarding parking standards themselves and inclusion of standards within the PMP or as a separate SPD. 	transport plans. Terminology relating to disabled people amended. Parking standards will be set out in Parking SPD.
ST6 Park and ride	DM34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for use of P&Rs as major transport modal shift locations. • Concern over harm to green belt, AONB and WHS if additional facilities proposed at P&R sites and some comments suggesting the sites should not be removed from the Green Belt. • Sites are not suitable for recycling centres due to semi-rural location and such facilities would generate additional traffic, air pollution, noise, light pollution. • P&R required on east side of city. Where will residents on east of Bath take their recycling? • Recycling facilities would generate. • Wessex Water easements cross 2 of the P&R sites. • Underground car parks preferred. • Solar canopies supported in general. 	Considered that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing the P&R sites from the Green Belt. They are proposed to be allocated for transport interchange use (and not recycling facilities) with clear site requirements that will ensure impacts to the WHS and its setting, AONB and ecology are fully considered, minimised and mitigated.
ST7 Transport requirements for managing development	DM35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All reference to a large park and ride car park on Bathampton Meadows or elsewhere to the east of Bath must be removed from planning policy. Provision should be retained for smaller transport interchanges that may be required on main transport routes to the east as part of Wiltshire Bus plans. • Various comments made, both for and against, regarding parking standards themselves and inclusion of standards within the PMP or as a separate SPD. 	References to a P&R site to the east of Bath and the area of search identified on diagram 1 are proposed to be removed. Alternative options for addressing the impact of car journeys from the east of Bath are being reviewed. Parking standards will be set out in parking SPD.
Place-Based Volumes			
B1 Bath spatial study		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PMP B1 10 b currently identifies as an action necessary to deliver 	Noted. This is outside the scope of the local plan

		<p>the Spatial Strategy for Bath “Delivering the measures identified in the Council’s Transport Strategy that are required to enable the economic growth aspirations of the city and the environmental improvements to be achieved.” The PMP also cites as a measure needed to support the vision of the Bath Transport Strategy: “Working with the Highways Agency, Wiltshire and other authorities to develop proposals and strategies to remove through traffic and HGVs, in particular, from Bath.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In view of: the low estimated extended life of a repaired Cleveland Bridge, the expected moves towards possible heavier maximum HGV loadings for sustainability/environmental reasons of reducing road mileage (48 Tonnes in the recent Government consultation), it has become clear that the removal of heavy vehicles from this route is more urgent than previously recognised. • It is suggested that the Local Plan should be updated to reflect greater urgency and the current framework for development of alternative plans – for example, reflecting: the inclusion of a Strategic Study for the M4 to Dorset Coast route in the Department for Transport Road Investment Strategy 2020 – 2025, and (b) the inclusion of "North South Connectivity Improvements" in the Complementary Travel and Transport Schemes that form part of B&NES's Transport Delivery Plan. 	<p>partial update. The issues are being considered through a Transport Delivery Plan for Bath and will be reflected, as necessary, in the new Local Plan.</p>
B4 The World Heritage Site and its setting		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A review of this policy is needed to reflect the change in emphasis in the latest NPPF. Climate change is an overarching theme that should run through all of the plan and not be inconsistently referenced within an individual policy. 	<p>Climate change (and the climate emergency) is central to the local plan partial update. The policy approach in respect of Policy B4 is considered consistent with national policy. However, this will be reviewed through the new Local Plan.</p>
BD1 Bath Design Policy		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is unacceptable that existing policy BD1 remains unamended. In a World Heritage City, the quality of design has, with few exceptions, so deteriorated in recent decades; Bath is promoted as a gem amongst cities and it cannot afford to see a historic core 	<p>This is a partial update and Bath Design Policy (including the government’s commitment to ‘beauty’) will be reviewed through the new Local Plan.</p>

		<p>compromised by mediocrity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparable cities and World Heritage sites generally have a city Architect or rotating Board of Architect/ Designers to provide the design scrutiny of applications. The ‘six wise men’ appointment of the late 90’s, drawn from the top echelon of UK urbanists, quickly disappeared. The recent announcement by Robert Jennrick that beauty will feature in upcoming planning legislation is a measure of public concern to which B&NES must respond with revised procedures and this should be done before Plan submission. 	
B2 Central area strategic policy		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Area Strategic Policy – recognised that this policy is scheduled for review, but consider it would be helpful not only if definitions of the central area and historic core could be made but also that the areas be delineated. 	Noted. To be considered/reviewed through the new Local Plan.
SB1 Development requirements and design principles Walcot Street / Cattlemarket site	Bath 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy should not be changed to allow residential at ground floor level. 	Noted. Some amendments to the allocation policy are proposed in the partial update to help deliver the objective of aiding recovery in Milsom Quarter, including facilitating additional residential development.
SB2 Development requirements and design principles Central Riverside and Recreation Ground	Bath 1 and Bath 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A significant number of standard template responses were received. Option 1: Approx 1,600 responses supporting Option 1 on both Policy B1 and Policy SB2 (no change to the existing policy wording but review it in the Full Local Plan) Option 3: Approx 25 responses supporting Option 3 on both Policy B1 and Policy SB2 (delete the policy through the Partial Update and revisit in the Full Local Plan) Option 2: No responses were received supporting Option 2 for either policies. (Review through the Partial Update) • It is noted that the Sustainability Appraisal omits to identify the removal of possible parking use as a material contribution that Option 3 would make over Option 1 (or Option 2 if suitable amendments removing parking are made) for the purposes of 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>There are substantial and strategic planning issues that need to be considered, which are best dealt with holistically as part of the process of development the new Local Plan. It is also important not to confuse the planning issues relating to the site with the legal issues (Bath Rugby Limited v Caroline Greenwood and others [2020]EWHC2662(ch) which is currently under appeal.</p> <p>Comment noted. Revised Transport policies would apply to new development.</p>

		<p>Climate Change policy and carbon objectives (which are of course not achievable by simple switch to electric vehicles).</p> <p>Environment Agency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been considerable work undertaken by the Council, the Rugby Club, Environment Agency and other stakeholders in seeking an appropriate solution to the replacement of the Pulteney Radial Gate, which is nearing the end of its design life. It is essential that this important work continues with appropriate policy support in the local plan. Our preferred option is option 1 - no change to policy SB2. 	<p>Comment noted. It is proposed to retain Policy SB2.</p>
<p>SB8 Western Riverside</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensitive conservation approach required on sites to the north of the river (located in CA). • Bath Artists' Studios should be safeguarded. • Requirement of Policy SB8 to enhance biodiversity and address climate change should be extended to include the allotments. Policy should clearly state the need for the impact of development on adjacent allotments to be mitigated by enhancements. • Affordable Housing provision is required on this site. • Environment Agency note that a sequential approach must be taken to the mix and placement of uses on site. There must also be sufficient operational access afforded to the River Avon and there is an opportunity to link with ambitions of the WaterSpace project and 25 Year Environment Plan. • Natural England supports proposed policy approach, particularly development being set back from the riverside. • Policy should be flexible and avoid detailing a specification of an appropriate land use mix and detailed parameters for the development - likely to be overly prescriptive. • Allocation should include reference to PBSA, co-living and Build to Rent (BTR) as well as general housing. Proposal to specify types of private homes (other than PBSA and BTR) and percentages of bedroom mix for the site is not supported. 	<p>Comments noted. Policy SB8 has been updated to help to facilitate the appropriate development of the site, providing clarity and certainty on the development requirements and design expectations to help shape the next phase of regeneration, taking into account the need to deliver the Council's priorities with regards to the climate and ecological emergency.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Viability needs to be weighed against policy requirements. Reduced parking levels supported. Exact proposed location of Sustainable Transport Route should be indicative in policy. Robust evidence required to show need of primary school and other commercial / community uses. 	
B3 Strategic policy for Twerton and Newbridge Riversides		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A strategic review of the policy for these areas is urgently required to avoid it becoming a 'student ghetto'. 	Policy approach to purpose built student accommodation (PBSA) has been reviewed through the local plan partial update in order to focus PBSA on campus and only proposals that meet a demonstrable need to be acceptable elsewhere in the city. Policy B3 will be reviewed through the new Local Plan.
SB10 Roseberry Place development requirements and design principles		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for option (ii) a mix of development, but oppose a change to residential throughout. • Also some supports for option (iii) - with allocation of residential development throughout Phase 2 and communal ground floor space for resident's amenity and on-site working sought. The refreshed policy should remain flexible so as to not preclude other compatible uses 	PMP allocation policy not proposed to be amended in the local plan partial update, primarily due to the role the employment space element of the allocation plays in delivering the Core Strategy (spatial strategy not proposed to be amended) and the progress in meeting city-wide planned employment (office) space.
SB14 Twerton Park		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PBSA should be allowed to fund the regeneration of the football club. 	Proposed policy in the local plan partial update enables higher density forms of residential accommodation (not limited to C3 use) but excludes PBSA due to the strategy of primarily focussing it on campus.
SB15 Hartwells Garage		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support retention of the policy with no amendments 	Noted.
SB17 Englishcombe Lane		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SB17 Englishcombe Lane, Tufa field. This development should be removed from the Local Plan. It is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest and should be protected and allowed to re-wild. Finance issues should not be an issue as ecological emergency declared. • LCR9 Increasing the Provision of Local Food Growing. • Refers to B&NES's own Local Food Strategy (2014-17) 	There is a resolution to grant planning permission for residential development of this site, subject to completion of a S106 agreement.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the issue of food security is becoming even more pressing, and re climate /ecological emergencies, LCR9 should be amended specifically to encourage small producers such as market gardeners using polytunnels and greenhouses. 	
SB18 Royal United Hospital		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments received from RUH setting out various key strategies including the new Strategic Plan, Sustainable Development Management Plan, Estate Strategy, Sustainable Green Infrastructure Plan and the New Hospital Plan. 	The updated Policy SB18 acknowledges and responds to key RUH plans. It also sets out further development requirements.
B5 Strategic policy for universities, private colleges and their impacts		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> University student numbers should be controlled in both Bristol and Bath as such a very high percentage of the housing need is used for students. Student housing (PBSA) should be counted as part of housing targets. 	The student accommodation is not counted as part of the Core Strategy housing targets. However, the revised Policy B5 (Universities) and SB19 (University of Bath) and H2A (Purpose Built Student Accommodation) would provide a framework to better manage the future demand for student accommodation.
SB19 University of Bath at Claverton Down		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support for on- site campus expansion which helps prioritise available sites within the city centre for other uses such as employment and housing rather than student accommodation. General objection on the use of artificial pitches. But the use of natural crumb on all weather pitches is very welcome. Sport England raises concern with the proposed loss of playing field (natural turf pitches the provision of the 2 x 3G AGPs land, and other sports facilities, (against para 97 of NPPF). The National Trust owns the land of Bushey Norwood (AONB, Green Belt) adjacent to the University of Bath at Claverton Down (WHS, part-AONB). We have previously noted that new development towards the edge of the campus and within the AONB may have implications for the AONB's landscape character and special qualities, depending on its scale and appearance. Additional light pollution and activity could also affect bats. We would ask that the Council and University continue to bear these points in mind in respect of the proposed masterplan and future development of the university campus. 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The revised Policy SB19 sets out the Development Framework Plan and General Development Principles responding to various evidence base studies. This includes the requirement to use natural crumb.</p> <p>The University of Bath has prepared the sport facilities statement (Topic Paper) which concludes that the provision of a 3G pitch would increase support capacity and facilitate greater opportunity for student and community use .</p> <p>The revised Policy SB19 includes specific requirements for the new development adjacent to Bushey Norwood informed by various evidence including the Masterplan Visual Analysis.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should the Council continue to consider the Claverton Down site to be sequentially preferable when assessing proposals for PBSA in areas at risk of flooding, as they have done over the previous plan period, it is vital that any specified development capacity is accurate and will realistically come forward. 	The revised Policy SB19 sets out the development capacity and Topic Paper for Student Accommodation sets out the accommodation demand. Based on the existing forecast it is considered that the policy approach is appropriate and realistic.
SB20 Bath Spa University, Newton Park Campus		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support for creative business hub, consolidating university teaching areas which will help sustainable transport and Sion Hill redevelopment. On balance this approach will help future employment opportunities. Any further student accommodation is not supported. some objection raised new additions to the Locksbrook Campus which would cause a loss to industrial and warehouse space. 	Comments Noted. Policy SB22 allocates the Locksbrook Creative Industry Hub. Policy H2A and B5 set out the approach for the new purpose built student accommodation.
B3A Land adjoining Odd Down, Bath strategic site allocation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This allocation should be reviewed in light of policy NE2 and its proposed amendment re. AONB sites. Policy should be amended to remove any further allocation of houses beyond the 171 already granted planning permission 	Noted. Planning applications will be determined against the current Core Strategy allocation policy, as well as the revised Policy NE2 that would apply to any new development. No new evidence to justify reducing allocation from current overall capacity of around 300 dwellings.
KE2B Riverside and fire station site		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site cannot accommodate 15 dwellings with the necessary parking provision and restrictive conditions of the site 	This issue will need to be responded to by the potential developers of the site and determined against the relevant planning policies (including KE3B) that apply.
KE3A Land adjoining East Keynsham strategic site allocation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any decision to release site for development should properly be made in the context of a comprehensive Green Belt review. Development of the site would need to ensure sufficient infrastructure improvements, including to the local highway network. 	The site was removed from the Green Belt and designated as safeguarded land as part of the Core Strategy (adopted in 2014). The site allocation requires the implementation of a comprehensive range of infrastructure improvements before the occupation of new housing.
KE3B Safeguarded land at East Keynsham		<p><u>General Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional development in Keynsham is suitable to help overcome housing shortfall 	<p><u>General</u></p> <p>The site was removed from the Green Belt and designated as safeguarded land as part of the Core</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure should be robust enough to accommodate growth and in place before development • Low carbon transport system and incorporation of 20 minute neighbourhood concept vital to well-being of the area • Suggested proposals are a segregated cycle path from the development to the train station and bus stops on the bypass that are accessed from Station Road to enable new residents to have a frequent service to the High Street and the Railway Station • A more realistic figure is 240 dwellings to accommodate the desired increase in ecology, with a new nature reserve created to the south of the A4 • Taking into account recent housing developments, area is at risk of over development taking accounts of the demands of transport, other services and loss of green space • Development risks urban sprawl of Keynsham and Bristol towards Saltford • Wider impact on surrounding villages should be investigated <p><u>North Keynsham</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the allocation of the site as early as possible, providing the certainty required to bring forward the significant investment needed for the early delivery of the land • Considered that the site forms a sustainable extension to the existing settlement and be in line with existing strategic policies of the adopted Local Plan • Support for planning for an increase in the number of resident houseboats as a way of achieving affordable housing in areas where other forms of housing would be inappropriate (i.e. in the areas of the site which may flood). Ideally as part of flood defences. • Resistance to further Green Belt release to prevent further erosion of the Green Belt around Keynsham and Saltford • Avon Valley Wildlife Park relocation should protect and enhance local ecology through native tree planting, protecting hedgerows, 	<p>Strategy (adopted in 2014). The site capacity proposed in the pre-submission draft plan is considered realistic and deliverable.</p> <p>The site allocation requires the implementation of a comprehensive range of transport, green infrastructure, and biodiversity improvements before the occupation of new housing.</p> <p><u>North Keynsham</u></p> <p>This area is not being proposed for allocation in the LPPU but will be considered as part of the new Local Plan (within the context set by the WECA SDS). The issues raised will be considered as part of this process.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>maintaining the openness of countryside and safeguarding it from encroachment, retention/enhancement of public footpaths and ensuring the Park retains in the Green Belt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wessex Water: Agreement must be reached on the proximity of development to Keynsham sewage treatment works (STW). Residential and other regularly occupied/sensitive development should not be planned in locations likely to be adversely affected by the operation of the STW. Policy must identify and safeguard land outside of the current STW boundary for expansion of the works, and consider access arrangements for maintenance activities. • Environment Agency: A sequential approach must be taken to flood risk and avoid the Broadmead functional floodplain. Where essential infrastructure is required to be sited in Flood Zone 3b, this should be designed to be operational during times of flood without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Any new buildings required to incorporate raised floor levels at least 300m above the 1% AEP with an approved allowance for climate change. No ground floor sleeping accommodation for buildings adjacent to the flood plain unless on significantly higher land with means of safe access and egress. No net loss of flood plain. Areas of functional floodplain retained. Consideration of Bristol Flood Strategy. 	
SSV2 South Road car park		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Road car park is considered to be integral to the vitality and viability of the High Street . • There is support to retain the car park at South Road and remove the allocation for retail. • There is support for the provision of a retail store at the Welton Bibby and Baron Site. • The Welton Bibby and Baron site has been promoted as a potential site for a new food store. 	<p>The parking survey has shown that South Road car park supports the vitality and viability of the High Street. Therefore the current Placemaking Plan allocation for a retail store is proposed to be removed.</p> <p>The Welton Bibby and Baron site allocation has been revised under policy SV4.</p>
PMP:SSV4 Former Welton		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the allocation of Welton Bibby & Baron Site as an alternative allocation site for retail store and car parking at the top 	<p>The retail study shows that there is a need for a medium scale retail store. The site at Welton has been</p>

manufacturing site		<p>end of the High Street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would draw more people to the High Street in general and benefit all of Midsomer Norton 	<p>assessed and is considered to be able to accommodate a medium retail store while retaining the requirements of the existing policy.</p>
PMP:SSV9 Old Mills Industrial Estate		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that the infrastructure is appropriate for the development. The roads in the area are unlikely to sustain a development of this type and size without substantial investment. • General support for the proposals to protect and enhance job opportunities in the Somer Valley by amending Policy SSV9, but objects to the inclusion of more retail/food in the proposed mix at Old Mills, based on impact on the viability of the High Street. Welcome a range of small light industrial and business units, and enterprises should be encouraged which would support a thriving business community on these sites, such as food and drink providers, and hotel or similar provision. • Mendip DC does not object to these proposals and continues to support the opportunity at the Somer Valley Enterprise Zone (SVEZ). However, MDC considers that the wider implications and cross-boundary impacts of the partial update, and the amendments to the SVEZ, remain to be robustly assessed. • Site Boundary: Langley Lane site should not be included. 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The revised Policy SSV9 7c only support the development of some retail, food & drink units if of a scale, type and format that does not harm, but complements, nearby town centres and that benefits the attractiveness and operation of the Enterprise Zone.</p>
General Other Issues			
Waste		<p>Environment Agency comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals for waste management activities or that include discharges that could result in an input of hazardous substances or non-hazardous pollutants, will require an Environmental Permit. • The permitting process operates separately to the planning process. Accordingly it is recommended that advice regarding permit requirements and the feasibility of such schemes is sought at an early stage. • With specific reference to the proposed development within Bath, consideration must be given to Section 33 of the County of Avon 1982-Protection of Hot Springs in Bath. This gives Bath and North 	<p>Comments noted. Proposed to address through the new Local Plan.</p>

		<p>East Somerset Council powers to protect the natural thermal springs that arise under artesian pressure in the centre of Bath, from damage that could result from excavations, piling operations or bore holes in the Bath area. Further information is available here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/services/environment/bath-hot-springs/county-avon-act-1982-section-33 • We advise an appropriate policy should be included to ensure development sites do not impact nearby watercourses by containing dirty water on site and using settlement methods if water is being discharged off site. • New developments must have adequate sewage disposal provisions if they are not connected to the mains sewer, to ensure discharges from private systems do not impact the environment. Reference should also be made to general pollution prevention principles, to reduce pollution risk from fuels and building materials at construction sites. 	
Consultation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not appropriate during the lockdown to prepare and consult on a partial update to the plan. It is inappropriate to be holding this consultation during a national lockdown when it is impossible for the community to meet up to discuss the documents. • Consultation Portal was not user-friendly – it would have helped if responses to multiple Development Management policies could have been set out in one form/return. Also would have been useful to be able to save progress and return to complete comments. 	<p>Government guidance makes it clear that plan-making should continue. There are issues that need addressing urgently in B&NES, including the climate and ecological emergencies and housing supply. The Council has followed the government’s recommended approach and has sought to engage local communities through a range of covid safe consultation activities. There will also be further opportunities to respond to the Reg 19 consultation which will also be well publicised.</p> <p>Comments on the consultation portal noted – changes to the portal proposed for Reg 19 consultation.</p>
General - Bath		<p>Concern that house prices in Bath are matching London and this will contribute to the deterioration of Bath losing its beauty and culture. Arts funding should be reinstated to protect and restore Bath’s culture/arts facilities. There should also be a policy which protects public art in Bath and reinstates funding. Empty shops should be turned</p>	<p>Local Plan Partial Update seeks to increase housing supply, mainly within Bath. Arts funding is outside the scope of the partial update. The role of empty shops can be considered through the new Local Plan.</p>

		into pop-ups and fill the spaces with food, culture and buzz.	
Electric Collective Taxis		Electric Collective Taxis, which could be known as “tECxis”, and currently technologically possible in “people carrier” size vehicles, would ensure reduced pollution and offer faster, more comfortable and dignified travel than buses into and through cities.	Noted, but outside the scope of the local plan partial update.
Brownfield Development		There should be a presumption in favour of the redevelopment of garage sites and surplus land, provided that they comply with the relevant Development Management policies set out in the Local Plan.	Noted – brownfield development that complies with the policies in the Development Plan is encouraged.
Strategic / Non-Strategic Policies		Disagree that all policies are strategic. Whilst the WECA Spatial Development Strategy (SDS) will not be adopted until 2023 at the earliest, it would be inaccurate to suggest that on completion of the Local Plan Partial Update, all strategic policies will be up-to-date, or otherwise in accordance with Paragraph 33 of the Framework.	Noted. The Council has applied the approach set out in the NPPF/PPG in identifying policies as strategic.
Short term rent		The impact of increasing numbers of short-term rentals/party houses on long-term housing for residents needs to be taken into account, including on demand for new housing and traffic levels.	Noted. The implications of this trend/issue will be assessed as part of work on the new Local Plan.
Policy gaps		<p>Policy needed on market gardens. The council has policies on local food production but these appear limited to allotments. Given the increasing urgency with which we must address food security, market gardens have a valuable role. The Local Plan update could have signalled the council’s support for such small ventures and committed to ensuring that planning regulations would not provide unnecessary blockers.</p> <p>Would also have expected to see the places where the council is planning to site the 100,000 trees it has committed to planting. There are opportunities for ‘tiny forests’ and re-wilding; the Tufa field would provide a perfect place for a laissez-faire re-wilding initiative.</p>	Noted. These policy areas will be considered in preparing the new Local Plan. The Tree & Woodland Delivery Plan currently under preparation will consider and identify sites/locations appropriate for tree planting.
Recycling		There needs to be a recycling centre in Bath that is accessible to	This issue is outside the scope of the local plan partial

		pedestrians, even if they need to ask a neighbour to give them a lift and drop them off. Many people in Bath don't have cars - a lot of people move here so they can give up a car. But not everything can be collected by the usual recycling lorry.	update. It is being looked as part of waste services strategy – any planning policy implications will then be considered through the new Local Plan.
--	--	---	--

Annex 3: Response to Local Plan Partial Update requests to amend Housing Development Boundaries

The schedule below summarises the minor amendments to the Housing Development Boundaries (HDB) raised during the Launch and Options (call for sites) consultation under Regulation 18 and the Council’s response in preparing the pre-submission draft Local Plan Partial Update (to be subject to consultation under Reg 19). These sites have been assessed against the [HDB guiding principles](#) developed to support the Placemaking Plan

Location	HELAA Ref	Key Issues	Response
Coombe Lane, Compton Martin	COM08	Include large garden	Disagree – this change would not accord with the main principle which states that the HDB will be drawn tightly around the village
Land adjacent to Tree Tops, Compton Martin	COM05	Include agricultural land	Disagree – this change would not accord with the main principle which states that the HDB will be drawn tightly around the village
Little Aden, East Harptree	EH05	Include garden and follow the boundary line	Disagree – inclusion of the garden would conflict with sub-principle 3 which excludes large gardens on the settlement edge
Hinton Blewett, site 1	HB02	Include pasture land north side of Upper Road adjacent to Oakridge to corner	Disagree – site is detached from settlement and consists of open space
Hinton Blewett, site 2	HB01	Include vegetable garden on Upper Road	Disagree – site is detached from settlement and consists of open space
Hinton Blewett, site 3	HB03	Include site adjacent to Middle Road Farm	Disagree – site is detached from settlement and consists of open space
MSN48, Midsomer Norton	MSN48	Include land north of Somer Ridge	Disagree – boundary would not be tightly defined around settlement edge and would result in HDB including open countryside.

2 North Road, Peasedown St John	PEA14	Inclusion of 2 North Road garden	Disagree – inclusion of the garden would conflict with sub-principle 3 which excludes large gardens on the settlement edge
Keel's Hill, Peasedown St John	PEA16	Inclusion of site north of Keel's Hill	Disagree – site visually separated from development and consists of open countryside
land west of Dunkerton	DUN02	Inclusion land west of Dunkerton	Disagree - encroaches into the Green Belt, HDB needs to remain tightly defined around settlement/Green Belt boundary

References

[HDB guiding principles, Placemaking Plan Housing Development Boundaries Review December 2015, Bath and North East Somerset Council](#)