

## Appendix A – Summary of Consultation Responses received

SA Implications	Summary of response	Officer consideration	Proposed modification
IMPROVE HEALTH	It is good to see provision for new green infrastructure, which is essential for building healthy communities	Noted	None
	Health connections and provision needs to be clarified.	Sections 5, 6 & 7 set out requirements for access to facilities (via both movement and green infrastructure networks) and what facilities are required	None considered necessary
	The queues are damaging to pedestrians, cyclists and residents bordering the A38. Stationary traffic builds up pollution.	Noted. The proposed Access & movement section sets out how sustainable travel will be promoted as part of development to minimise these impacts. The impacts of development will be considered through Environmental Impact Assessments, submitted as part of planning applications.	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Section 4. Vision & Objectives insert: <i>Where necessary the Council will seek effective methods of controlling the noise impacts arising from the road traffic and railway movements as part of development.</i>
	Concern over noise pollution resulting from construction and traffic.	Noted. The proposed Access & movement section sets out how sustainable travel will be promoted as part of development to minimise these impacts. The impacts of development will be considered through Environmental Impact Assessments, submitted as part of planning applications.	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Section 4. Vision & Objectives insert: <i>Where necessary the Council will seek effective methods of controlling the noise impacts arising from the road traffic and railway movements as part of development.</i>
	Environmental Health request range of additional wording referencing Environmental Protection Issues such as noise, air quality and contaminated land.	General reference can be made within the introductory sections of the document, but assessment of these issues will form part of outline applications. The purpose of the SPD is to set out the infrastructure requirements for the area.	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Section 4. Vision & Objectives insert: <i>Where necessary the Council will seek effective methods of controlling the noise impacts arising from the road traffic and railway movements as part of development.</i>
	Support reference to Health	Noted	None considered necessary

	Impact Assessment		
<b>SUPPORT COMMUNITIES THAT MEET PEOPLES NEEDS</b>	Objection to allocation on basis of disturbance of existing residents on Charlton Road and Catbrin with possible overloading of existing services, Water, Sewage Power etc	Principle of the allocation considered through Core Strategy Examination in Public.  Section 9 sets out requirements and recommendations for utilities networks  Principle 7.3 sets out requirement for development to be informed by site-wide water strategy	None considered necessary
	Would like a swimming pool or leisure centre incorporated into the area	Infrastructure requirements generated by this development have been considered through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and each iteration of the draft SPD. An indoor sports facility is an infrastructure requirement (p.37) but a new swimming pool/ leisure centre were not considered justified due to existing capacity in surrounding facilities.	None considered necessary
	Important to give the area its own identity related to its geography – suggest New Charlton, Charlton village or similar.	Noted	None considered necessary
	Co-location means more traffic impact on neighbouring roads.	Co-location is intended to create more linked trips, reducing the amount of traffic and travel to a destination.	None considered necessary
	Important to provide various shops etc including leisure facilities, pubs etc, and provision at same time as houses	Agreed. The purpose of the SPD is to set out the infrastructure requirements for the area and when they should be delivered.	None considered necessary
	Would like to see a variety of housing rather than town houses, which are unsuitable for young children and the elderly	Noted. Dwelling type/ mix will be determined through individual planning applications.	None considered necessary
	Existing or proposed schools,	Noted. The Access & movement section sets out how	None considered necessary

	colleges, and bus stops should be accessible by bicycle and have lock-up facilities	sustainable travel will be promoted to both new and existing facilities and services. The detailed requirements for new facilities will be considered as part of individual planning applications	
	Re: Skanska Development – Support with provisos to make sure affordable housing is spread over the whole development. Not one location/ghetto	Noted. The details of affordable housing distribution will be considered as part of individual planning applications	None considered necessary
	Support no communal parking area and garage areas. Low build housing with opportunities for outside drying etc.	Noted	None considered necessary
	Object to provision for new traveller site or enlargement of existing - impact on secondary school.  Ensure no new traveller site is built near to proposed secondary school.	Noted. Proposals will be considered as part of individual planning applications	None considered necessary
	It is not clear why the Brabazon Hangar cannot be used for the museum, as these could accommodate Concorde and the other Bristol Aero Collection exhibits, as well as other facilities such as a restaurant and gift shop	Noted. The Bristol Aero Collection, who will be development the museum, have identified the existing cluster of hangars as their preferred choice of location. Brabazon Hangar is outside the allocation boundary, within the administrative boundary of Bristol City Council.	None considered necessary

	Community Infrastructure diagram should include reference to The Mall as an existing regional shopping centre	Noted	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Section 6. Community Infrastructure diagram amend: <i>To show existing out-of-town shopping centre</i>
	Use area to build an ice rink/ stadium/ arena.	Infrastructure requirements generated by this development have been considered through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and each iteration of the draft SPD. Whilst there was no specific need identified for such facilities Policy CS26 does allow for the provision of spectator sports facilities.	None considered necessary
	Object – no revamped or new facilities for Patchway itself.	The purpose of the SPD is to set out the infrastructure requirements generated by this development, which should be provided on-site	None considered necessary
	There is a real concern that development could distract investment from surrounding areas and do little to Patchway [and Filton] climb out of our Priority Neighbourhood Status.	Noted. The objectives of the development are to encourage inward investment to the area. However, the purpose of the SPD is to set out the infrastructure requirements of the new neighbourhood development only.	None considered necessary
	Section 3 Site Context states there is a general lack of adequate and sufficient community facilities in the area. Development of the area should provide facilities to serve the new homes it is providing, not resolve all existing deficiencies in the area.	Noted, although the purpose of this section is outline the context and characteristics of the wider area, and highlight the importance of adequate services and facilities being provided.	None considered necessary
	Is there any way of knowing what the plans are for the	The Local Authority will invite a range of academy sponsors to apply to operate the new school. A final decision to appoint a	None considered necessary

	school(s)? The immediate area has an over-abundance of religious schools	sponsor will be taken by the Secretary of State for Education.	
	First buildings to be built should be schools, health centre and public buildings to avoid pressure on Bristol for these services before houses are built	The pre-adoption draft sets out the timing and requirements for infrastructure delivery at this allocation.	None considered necessary
	The table at page 35 contemplates that the nursery serving the DFSR [Skanska] land should be located within the Haw Wood centre. For ease of access to the proposed family housing, and to take advantage of the potential for shared facilities, DFSR propose to co-locate the nursery with the Primary School. We ask that the SPD be amended to enable this	Noted, SPD diagrams are intended to illustrate key principles not be fixed masterplans. The local centre identified also overlaps with the area identified in the recent planning application, which will be considered on its own merits and in view of the strategic objectives of this allocation.	None considered necessary
	DFSR have set out their approach to public art, namely that it should be embedded in the public realm through the design process rather than being achieved by financial contribution. We ask that the Supplementary Planning Document recognises the validity of this approach	SPD does recognise this, setting out proposed areas of the development, including the public realm where public art can be embedded as part of the design process.	None considered necessary
	The Table at Page 36 and Figure 6 both reference 'temporary libraries'. These	The table states that the Council will investigate with developers to the potential to provide temporary library accommodation within a community centre prior to the	None considered necessary

	are new since the publication of the first draft of the Supplementary Planning Document, and because they have the potential to be costly, a specification needs to be required as a matter of urgency.	permanent facility being built out to ensure provision is made as early as possible for new residents. A specification can be provided but the intention would be to utilise a building being provided anyway, and so should not result in any significant additional cost.	
	Trigger points too low for schools etc co location means increased traffic and pollution	Trigger points are provided rather than target dates as a better mechanism for ensuring infrastructure is phased with development. Trigger points are generated by the number of pupils required to make a school viable on opening.	None considered necessary
	As high a percentage of affordable housing should be built – 35% is not high	35% affordable housing is the target set out in Core Strategy policy, reiterated in the SPD (Section 8, Principle 8.2). The SPD cannot go beyond higher level policy in setting targets for affordable housing.	None considered necessary
	SPD to state Affordable housing to be integrated	Nature and location of affordable housing is set out in draft Affordable Housing and Extra Care SPD, which is referenced in Principle 8.2	None considered necessary
	The refusal, in paragraph 8.2, even to consider flats above retail premises is arbitrary and unreasonable and should be removed.	This statement was made in the light of recent schemes where the Council's registered housing providers have not accepted flats over retail premises. Nonetheless the wording could be considered unreasonable and it is recommended it is modified.	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Section 8. Principle 8.2 amend: <i>"The Council will <b>only</b> accept the provision of affordable housing flats over retail premises <b>in exceptional circumstances.</b>"</i>
	Support public art that is prominent, appropriate and relevant	Noted	None considered necessary
	Lack of clarity between the map on Page 48: Green and Blue Infrastructure, which shows a major part of the Haw	Noted. The SPD diagrams are intended to illustrate only the key principles set out in the text. There is no fundamental conflict between sports uses and local centre uses, and in some instances there are benefits in proximity and even co-	None considered necessary

	Wood extension area as designated for Sports Use, and the map on Page 58: Land Use: where there is an overlapping symbol for "Local centre/economic development land"	location.	
	It is difficult to envisage how a 'local centre' can be developed in the proposed location west of the A4018 with the sporting facilities at its heart. This is even more difficult in view of the physical relationship of the clubs to the public realm. Deeley Freed Skanska Residential commend the location proposed in their planning application	SPD diagrams are intended to illustrate key principles not be fixed masterplans. The local centre identified also overlaps with the area identified in the recent planning application, which will be considered on its own merits and in view of the strategic objectives of this allocation..	None considered necessary
	Concern over trigger points for new schools – appear very late with no interim plans to cope with demand before their requirement	Timing of schools provision reflects the number of pupils generated by this development that would make a new school viable to operate.	None considered necessary
	Previous SPD version identified a mixed use centre straddling Cribbs Causeway, The Laurels and the site opposite. Object to this no longer being shown. SPD now fails to engage with Cribbs Causeway and isolates the substantial community to the	Local centre has not been deleted, only relocated further south where it will relate more appropriately to a potential rail station, and adjacent development sites thereby serving a wider population	None considered necessary

	north (Skanska site) providing them with limited services within walkable distance.		
	Welcome the Council investigating the potential to deliver gypsy and traveller pitches on-site. SPD should clarify that any off-site provision or contribution does not erode the greenbelt.	Noted. Any proposals for off-site provision will need to be considered on their own merits.	None considered necessary
	Travellers site must be identified on the SPD map if it is to be built within the CPNN	Amendments to Core Strategy policy encourage, not require, provision of gypsy and traveller sites. Identification of specific sites not appropriate.	None considered necessary
	Require confirmation that South Glos demonstrate services for families with young children are an integral part of the plan and budgetted for accordingly.	Provision of space for such services are proposed to be accommodated within nurseries/ community centres and secondary school.	None considered necessary
	Section 6 page 30. Change "Retail could include" to "Retail must include local convenience shopping and a cafe"	Noted. Intention of this section is to indicate the nature, role and function of local centres across the wider area, not to fix what uses each should contain.	None considered necessary
	Heritage Museum - We are concerned at the lack of drive and leadership behind this required development. The project still appears to rely on the vagaries of a Concorde Trust that may never raise	Noted.	None considered necessary



	sufficient funds to deliver their dreams.		
	CPNN Partners agree with the principle of community services and facilities being located within multi-use buildings	Noted	None considered necessary
	There is a definite need for additional tennis facilities at a community level within this area surrounding Bristol	Noted	None considered necessary
	M+G Real Estate consider reference should be made to two additional sites and their potential for mixed commercial, retail or employment generating uses	Proposals for sites can be considered as part of planning applications and will be assessed in terms of how they contribute to the overall objectives of Policy CS26. Since Policy CS26 is primarily a residential allocation, and the purpose of the SPD is to set out the infrastructure requirements generated by this allocation, it is not considered appropriate to reference the potential of specific sites for commercial use in this document.	None considered necessary
	Reference should be made within the SPD to the importance of The Mall to the new neighbourhood, existing communities, and the potential for additional retail development at The Mall	Core Strategy policy CS14 sets out the Council's policy regarding retail development within the district, and any potential retail development at The Mall. Policy CS26, which this document is intended to amplify, does not make reference to expansion of the Mall. It would therefore not be in accordance with higher level policy to note potential retail development at The Mall	None considered necessary
<b>DEVELOP THE ECONOMY</b>	Concern over the closure and disposal by BAE Systems of the Filton Airfield site because of the impact the loss of such	Implications of the closure of Filton Airfield were considered at Core Strategy Examination in Public, and found sound.	None considered necessary

	an important strategic asset would have in terms of employment opportunities and infrastructure problems on Bristol's northern fringe.		
	Not enough commercial development within the site.	The proposed amount of employment land is considered commensurate with the need to balance jobs and housing, and also support the objectives of the Filton Enterprise Area. Nonetheless further clarification regarding the anticipated uses within the employment area are suggested.	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Section 8. Principle 8.4 insert: <i>"The Core Strategy identifies around 50ha of employment land within the New Neighbourhood. The expectation is that this will be primarily provided in an employment area at the eastern end of the airfield and specifically aimed at supporting the principles of the Filton Enterprise Area. It is further expected that around 30ha will be directly useable for employment purposes to support the principles of the Filton Enterprise Area, with the remainder taking account of the need for the Great Western Air Ambulance and National Police Air Services, Heritage Museum, local centre, access roads, drainage and landscaping ."</i>
	Rail supply chain needs to be added to the aerospace industry i.e. link to Hatchet Road depot.	Employment proposals in this area are intended to support the aims and objectives of the Enterprise Area, focussed on aerospace design, research and manufacture. Any proposals for rail-related businesses would be considered on their own merits	None considered necessary
	The area's economic role in relation to other Enterprise Areas, including Severnside, needs to be clarified	The aims of the Filton Enterprise Area are set out at pages 4 and 51, as they relate to and influence proposals at the Cribbs/ Patchway New Neighbourhood. The purpose of this SPD is to set out the infrastructure requirements for development of the new neighbourhood.	None considered necessary
	Planned industrial area will only create 700 jobs	This is a misunderstanding. The main employment area is likely to provide in the order of 6,000 jobs with a further 700 jobs in the associated local centre.	None considered necessary
	Enterprise Area will generate business rate returns for the Council. We would argue this is a funding stream that should be used to help attract future investment in our Aerospace Park and further benefit Filton in enhancing our infrastructure	Noted. The infrastructure and funding proposals behind the Enterprise Area are not the concern of this SPD	None considered necessary

	to help our local small to medium businesses to remain competitive as well as to enable future development of our Town Centre.		
	Aerospace Park - concern that many of the proposed developments for the eastern end of the airfield site distract from our objective to ensure we enhance and support our world leadership in aerospace	Noted. The SPD sets out the aspirations for the employment area, and the priority placed on contributing towards the objectives of the Filton Enterprise Area	None considered necessary
	Airbus should place orders with GKN not overseas companies	No comment	None considered necessary
	Consider if Hybrid Air Vehicle company requires space for manufacture	The proposed allocation relating to employment land is considered sufficiently flexible to accommodate a range of businesses	None considered necessary
	Need for employment use is questionable given current amount of vacant premises in Aztec West and Almondsbury business parks, and presence of undeveloped Rolls Royce site	Amount of employment land considered at Core Strategy Examination in Public, and was found sound.	None considered necessary
	Important that Airbus' operational needs continue to be recognised and properly reflected in the SPD	Airbus are an important part of the Filton Enterprise Area but the purpose of this SPD is to set out the infrastructure requirements generated by the development of the new neighbourhood.	None considered necessary
	Future land uses should remain complimentary and support the employment allocation, and avoid further shrinkage of commercial	Noted. The proposed allocation relating to employment land is considered sufficiently flexible to accommodate a range of new businesses, without negatively impacting on existing businesses.	None considered necessary

	development adjacent to Airbus boundaries.		
	Airbus welcome provision of hotel and conferencing facilities	Noted	None considered necessary
	Airbus welcomes proposed local centre at eastern end of former airfield – should incorporate crèche and nursery facilities as well as food and drink outlets to benefit existing employees.	Noted	None considered necessary
	Filton Enterprise Area (FEA) only recently introduced but is given priority status, referenced under a specific heading (p.5). States the FEA has no status but does not make clear what status it is intended to have and by what means its aspirations may be delivered. Wholly inappropriate to give this designation anything like development plan policy via this SPD.	Reference to the Filton Enterprise Area in the introduction & Background section is intended to provide context to the New Neighbourhood allocation.  There is no intention to give it any planning status through this document – only to acknowledge the role that employment land as part of the new neighbourhood has in contributing to its aims. How this is intended to be achieved is set out in the Land Use section (p.51)	None considered necessary
	Relevant Core Strategy policies (e.g. CS12 and CS13) are not mentioned. Unclear how prescriptive nature of employment uses (p.5) can be reconciled with Core Strategy policies and NPPF.	How employment land as part of the new neighbourhood can contribute to the aims of the Filton Enterprise Area is set out in the Land Use section (p.51). Consider additional wording in Introduction & Background section to clarify that the additional detail to Policy CS26 set out in this SPD should be read the context of policies in the Core Strategy	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Section 1. Introduction & Background p.3 insert: <i>“It will add detail to policies set out in the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy, and should be read in conjunction with the Core Strategy and policies within it.”</i>
	Development itself should be carried out so as to maximise the use of the local workforce,	Section 8 Land Use seeks to encourage opportunities for training and apprenticeships (Principle 8.5)	None considered necessary

	and this should be incorporated into contracts and undertakings.		
	SPD should incorporate commitment to provision of accessible training for local workforce	Section 8 Land Use seeks to encourage opportunities for training and apprenticeships (Principle 8.5)	None considered necessary
	SPD should incorporate a specific commitment to provision of flexible low-cost office/ workshop/ studio spaces, and statement that broadband provision should be appropriate for and support new small businesses.	The proposed allocation relating to employment land is considered sufficiently flexible to accommodate a range of new businesses.  The opportunities for broadband provision are set out in Section 9 Utilities & Renewable Energy	None considered necessary
	Support objective for Bristol North Fringe being a major economic driver in the South West region	Noted	None considered necessary
	Request p.4 final bullet point amended to state 'an enhanced employment area of around 20-30ha focussed on aerospace...'	The Introduction & Background section is intended to provide an overview of strategic objectives for the development of the new neighbourhood. Details of employment provision are contained in Section 8 Land Use	None considered necessary
<b>PROVIDE ACCESS TO MEET PEOPLE'S NEEDS WITH LEAST DAMAGE TO COMMUNITIES</b>	We need to learn from experience of other housing developments in the north fringe, where housing and car parking has been delivered prior to provision for sustainable transport.	Noted.	None considered necessary

AND ENVIRONMENT			
	Needs to be a commitment to ensure a package of sustainable transport promotion and provision is in place from the day the residents sign contracts.	The principle is noted but in practice it will be necessary to phase transport improvements based both on developer and public expenditure.	None considered necessary
	There is a need to accommodate an east-west route towards Cribbs Causeway as per the local authorities' Cycling Ambition proposals.	This is incorporated into the Access and Movement Section	None considered necessary
	SPD should require existing and new junctions to be <u>optimised</u> for use by cyclists and pedestrians, rather than just providing 'facilities' by way of 'shared use' proposals	Detailed proposals for cycle infrastructure will be considered on their merits as part of planning applications	None considered necessary
	'Filtered permeability' should be used as design standards within 20mph residential streets	Noted, and although not mentioned specifically the principles contained in the Access and Movement section	None considered necessary
	To achieve cycling priority means giving cycles priority for cycle routes across roads, and would likely require full segregation (subway or bridge) across distributor roads	Detailed proposals for cycle infrastructure will be considered on their merits as part of planning applications	None considered necessary
	A 2-3m wide shared-use pavement alongside a road	Where shared-use paths are considered acceptable the SPD sets out a minimum 4m width. However, Detailed proposals	None considered necessary

	and giving way at every side road and roundabout arm is not acceptable	for cycle infrastructure will be considered on their merits as part of planning applications	
	The requirement for paths to be a minimum of 4 metres is onerous. Sustrans' requirement is for 3 metres, which should be applied here.	4m width refers to shared paths (i.e. footpaths/ cycleways). Detailed proposals for cycle infrastructure will be considered on their merits as part of planning applications	None considered necessary
	Segregation of cycle and footpaths from each other and from general traffic should be standard for everywhere above 20mph	Noted. Detailed proposals for cycle infrastructure will be considered on their merits as part of planning applications	None considered necessary
	Should indicate that walking distances will not be applied slavishly. There are locations where, for example, topography prevents these distances from being achieved.	Noted but individual proposals can demonstrate where and why aspiration cannot be met and consideration given as part of planning applications.	None considered necessary
	We support the local authorities' ambition to ensure a quality public transport route from Charlton Road is developed as soon as possible	Noted	None considered necessary
	Crow Lane Roundabout signalisation is a retrograde step	Option to signalise Crow Lane roundabout forms part of an transport package designed to mitigate the impacts of the development as a whole	None considered necessary
	Support the provision for future Metrobus extension	Noted	None considered necessary
	It must be ensured that development density increases	Noted. Details will be considered as part of individual applications	None considered necessary

	with proximity to (rail) station sites		
	It must be ensured that development takes place in harmony with timescales for Henbury line	Noted in principle but in practice it will be necessary to phase transport improvements based both on developer and public expenditure, and the timetable for Phase II of the MetroWest project	None considered necessary
	Stations built first	Noted in principle but in practice it will be necessary to phase transport improvements based both on developer and public expenditure, and the timetable for Phase II of the MetroWest project	None considered necessary
	Development pattern - it is important that the streets of the new neighbourhood are laid out in such a way as to provide clear, straight, easily legible access routes to the new stations. The comments in section 5 about cul-de-sacs suggest that, to some extent, this is already envisaged.	Noted	None considered necessary
	A disadvantage of the old Henbury station site (immediately to the east of the B4055) is that it is separated from the CPNN by the A4018 dual carriageway, which passengers would need to cross in walking between the CPNN and the station	Noted, although the intention for development regardless of train station site is to create improved crossing points over the A4018 to enhance pedestrian/ cycle movement.	None considered necessary
	North Filton - the case for station is strengthened by the proposed new heritage museum nearby. We suggest	Noted	None considered necessary



	there should be a direct route between the proposed museum and the station,		
	Charlton - should also be considered as a station location, to serve the proposed sports provision and the central part of the residential area.	Noted but this location has already been discounted in conjunction with Network Rail due to flood risk issues.	None considered necessary
	Public Transport - If there is going to be a push on public transport, make every effort to ensure it is affordable.	Noted, although fares are not set by the Council but the bus operators	None considered necessary
	The connections and general layout of the A4018 needs to be planned as an integral part of the SPD. Any improvements or alterations should be put in place prior to the housing component being constructed to ease the transition	Noted in principle but in practice it will be necessary to phase transport improvements based both on developer and public expenditure. Current wording of delivery and timing allows review of proposed measures to be undertaken to see if they are fit for purpose.	None considered necessary
	There may well be occasions on which the Council needs to use its CPO powers - for example, to deliver necessary connections, e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- footpath/ cycleway through The Laurels (between land west of the A4018 and the new secondary school), and</li> <li>- cycle connections across Berwick Drive, which is privately owned</li> </ul>	Noted. Detailed proposals such as these will be considered on their merits	None considered necessary

	The Council should commit to using the New Homes Bonus money from this development to part fund the proposed Metro West Phase Two.	Other sources of funding will be explored as MetroWest project progresses. However, only secured funding, identified in the SPD, is the devolved Major Scheme Funding via the LEP.	None considered necessary
	Encourage South Gloucestershire to consider again the possibility of a Charlton Halt station to further promote rail use.	Noted, however Network Rail excluded this option on grounds of flood risk.	None considered necessary
	Development will result in overloading A4018, Charlton Road and M5 Junction 17 with more traffic making it a major bottleneck for Bristol residents travelling North to the M5	The proposed transport package is intended to mitigate the impacts of additional traffic as a result of development	None considered necessary
	Bus disruption with routing to Cribbs Causeway/ The Mall shopping centre already causing bus delays at peak times	Noted	None considered necessary
	Access and movement (SPD) Bridgehouse/BAE land is used first for the road network other smaller developers can then glue themselves to this road network.	The principle is noted. In practice it will be necessary to phase transport improvements based both on developer/ public expenditure, and phasing/ timing of the sites themselves.	None considered necessary
	Provide Park & Ride at the proposed railway station sites	The proposed stations will be local ones that, whilst incorporating some car parking, will not have the frequency of service to support park and ride facilities. This can be reviewed as detailed MetroWest proposals emerge.	None considered necessary
	Organise traffic control at Crow Lane roundabout to prevent long tail backs	Noted, mitigation works to Crow Lane form part of the transport package set out in Section 5 Access and Movement	None considered necessary

	Open up station road to 2-way traffic	Noted. Details will be considered as part of planning applications	None considered necessary
	Provide road linking Charlton Road and Highwood Road	Access & Movement diagram indicates a bus only link between Charlton Road and Highwood Road	None considered necessary
	Should consider trolley buses with overhead electric cables	Transport package is focussed on creating/ improving pedestrian and cycle linkages, and improving local and strategic bus network.	None considered necessary
	Support bus, pedestrian/ cycle only access via Charlton Rd to prevent area around Southmead becoming completely congested	Noted	None considered necessary
	Pedestrian/ cycle link shown going through The Mall may not be practical for reasons of changes in level. Alternative routes may be more effective	Noted. SPD diagrams are indicative of key principles only and not intended to be fixed masterplans. The principle in this instance was to indicate more/ better pedestrian/ cycle links across the wider area.	None considered necessary
	No through road to Fishpool Hill or Charlton Road either in to or out of CPNN	Noted. Proposed transport package reflects this and requires proposals to prevent full vehicular ingress/ egress from these points	None considered necessary
	If Crow Lane roundabout is removed as part of the road mitigation package then I believe that the council should be aware that the removal of a right hand turning at any traffic light controlled crossroads would seriously complicate traffic matters for existing residents and also seriously	Noted. Preventing right turns as part of signalisation is an option under consideration but SPD refers only to signalisation rather than tie down a specific solution until implications are fully understood.	None considered necessary

	hamper the existing businesses in the area		
	All primary and secondary roads should have a discrete cycleway in addition to those shown on the plan	SPD diagrams are intended to illustrate key principles only, and should not be read as a 'fixed' masterplan. Details of individual proposals will be considered as part of planning applications	None considered necessary
	All residential roads should have dual use footpaths and cycleways, constructed so they cannot be used for parking	Detailed proposals for cycle infrastructure will be considered on their merits as part of planning applications. Where shared-use paths are considered acceptable the SPD sets out a minimum 4m width.	None considered necessary
	Need suitable direct on-carriageway or straight cycle-path commuting routes as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Gipsy Patch Lane – Merlin Rd</li> <li>- Charlton Rd – Merlin Rd</li> <li>- Airbus site A38 underpass to Merlin Rd</li> <li>- Airbus site A38 underpass to Charlton Rd</li> </ul>	Noted. SPD sets out provision of strategic walking and cycling links between key points/ destinations, which cover the roads suggested	None considered necessary
	Charlton Road – San Andreas roundabout link - concerned that without any physical way of preventing traffic it will be used as a short cut. Would like to see a cycle/pedestrian way only.	Noted, intention is that access at each end will be restricted to pedestrians, cyclists and bus only.	None considered necessary
	Extra roundabouts will impede flow of traffic and cause jams.	Purpose of the SPD is to set out infrastructure requirements. Details of how infrastructure will be implemented will be considered on their merits as part of planning applications	None considered necessary

	Object to any suggestion of through route at Charlton Common for cars.	Noted, intention is that access at each end will be restricted to pedestrians, cyclists and bus only.	None considered necessary
	Object to bus access across Charlton Common from Persimmon development. Access to be via San Andreas to Charlton Road route	Noted, but improving bus access across the wider area, of which this would for part, is considered to benefit of the wider population in terms of providing easy access to key facilities and destinations	None considered necessary
	Support plans to ensure neighbourhoods within 400 metres of public transport.	Noted	None considered necessary
	Rail scheme should include line from Henbury to Avonmouth to enable work at Avonmouth and link to Severn Beach line	Noted – work is ongoing in relation to MetroWest project (Phase II), which is a separate West of England Partnership scheme to this development	None considered necessary
	Ensure pedestrian and cycle routes are given priority during the phasing of the development to give new residents access to employment and shopping centres in a safe manner	Noted	None considered necessary
	Object to Skanska proposals - Passage Road will be used as	Application now submitted and will be considered in relation to this document.	None considered necessary

	a rat run when A4018 congested		
	Support railway stations in principle	Noted	None considered necessary
	CPNN Partners understand that whilst 3 options for station sites are shown (and have been incorporated into developer proposals) only 2 are required. Council need to decide as soon as s possible the final locations in order to remove uncertainties over the location(s) not required so that alternative uses can be brought forward.	Noted.	None considered necessary at this stage
	Any existing or proposed schools or colleges in the area should be accessible by cycle, and have cycle lockup facilities; as should bus stops	SPD deals with new infrastructure and Section 5 is intended to set the principles by which facilities are easily accessible by cycle. Specifying lockup facilities is too detailed for this SPD	None considered necessary
	Proposals appear ad-hoc and full detail not available on transportation and drainage	Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessments 1 and 2, and North Fringe Transport modelling documents are available to view on the website.	None considered necessary
	Upgrade all main roads to dual carriageway with overpass/light junctions	Transport proposals for the new neighbourhood are intended to facilitate a shift towards more sustainable modes of transport, rather than increasing capacity of the road network, attract more motorists and add to existing congestion.	None considered necessary
	Opportunity to partner with	Noted	None considered necessary

	Sustrans in development of the cycle network		
	A spur railway line could potentially lead to a new station at Cribbs Causeway	Does not form part of any proposal, either private sector or through MetroWest scheme.	None considered necessary
	Support proposal to redevelop (widen) the railway bridge on Gypsy Patch lane	Noted	None considered necessary
	Bristol Port Company consider station locations/ development should form part of the SPD	Noted but rail proposals form part of a separate West of England scheme (MetroWest Phase II). This development seeks to safeguard land for potential rail stations.	None considered necessary
	Metrobus needs to link Parkway to the Mall and Henbury Station	Noted, proposals at present link Metrobus The Mall and Parkway station	None considered necessary
	Full bus network map needs to be developed and integrated with North Bristol network and Bristol City centre	Noted. This SPD deals only with infrastructure requirements generated by the Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhood.	None considered necessary
	Proposals should include properly designed and defined cycle lanes from the top of Filton Hill to the motorway at Almondsbury	Noted. SPD sets out provision of strategic walking and cycling links between key points/ destinations.	None considered necessary
	Consider how to manage the traffic using the Mall	Transport package can only address transport implications arising from development.	None considered necessary
	Insufficient account of strategic highway infrastructure requirements and funding	Section 5 sets out the details of strategic infrastructure and delivery	None considered necessary

	Principle 5.5 states cul-de-sacs permissible in exceptional circumstances - what is exceptional please state this?	This will be dependent on individual circumstances of a site/development parcel and all circumstances cannot be set out here. The main aim of this is to ensure buildings are accessed from the street and not from the rear to ensure a well-used and overlooked public realm	None considered necessary
	Aims regarding health and well (p.17), comprehensive development (p.6), and access (section 5) cannot be achieved unless permanent connections are built prior to construction of housing.	The principle is noted but in practice development parcels will need to contribute to the objectives of comprehensive development as they get built out.	None considered necessary
	Rail timing – this should be prefunded by Developers and SG home bonus monies and not reliant on LEP, WEP. SGCC should be driving this forward and not merely leaving it to a later date.	The provision and timing of rail infrastructure is lead by the West of England Partnership MetroWest project. Contributions to rail form part of the transport package for Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhood	None considered necessary
	The SPD fails to state how full integration between the different uses and provisions of facilities and infrastructure both within the CPNN and beyond the area will be achieved if piecemeal is allowed. It is contradicting CS26. The development of the new CPNN provides the opportunity to maximise the sites connections and reconnect its surroundings, and to promote sustainable	The purpose of the SPD is add detail to Policy CS26, and reiterate the requirement for comprehensive development and how this can be achieved.	None considered necessary



	forms of transport on if phased developers can connect to the whole CPNN. Ease and access must be a measure of a successful and sustainable neighbourhood which can quickly and easily access the whole CPNN		
	Object to railway station site near Fishpool Hill - unsuitable location given flooding which has stopped trains running in past.	Noted. Discussion with Network Rail over most appropriate location for new stations, taking into account factors such as flood risk, is ongoing. Accordingly SPD sets out station location options.	None considered
	Need for inclusion of specific targets for new rail lines not just new rail stations	Provision of rail infrastructure needs to be co-ordinated with Devolved Major Scheme funding stream from the Local Enterprise Partnership. It is not the intention to fund Phase II of the MetroWest project from this development and the SPD is worded accordingly.	None considered necessary
	First thing to be built should be a park & ride on the vacant Rolls Royce East Works site	This SPD covers the Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhood, not surrounding sites	None considered necessary
	Essential that construction traffic uses South Glos road network not Bristol road network	Consideration of construction and environmental impacts will be provided with each application in an Environmental Impact Assessment	None considered necessary
	What is meant within the SPD by "the Transport Assessment process"?	Transport Assessments are submitted as part of planning applications, and will be considered in relation to the transport modelling undertaken by the Council and the requirements of Core Strategy policy and this SPD	None considered necessary
	SPD should define a process	Core Strategy allocations land for development to address the whole district's housing need. A transport package has	None considered necessary

	for monitoring patronage of public transport as development proceeds. If it does not increase later phases of development must not be allowed to proceed.	been developed to address the needs of development, and this is set out in the SPD	
	Opportunity to remedy restricted access north south. The potential for existing linkages across the railway line to be maintained and improved should be recognised in the SPD	Noted, Access & Movement diagram and principles note the opportunity to improve north-south connections	None considered necessary
	Cribbs Patchway provides opportunity not just to address traffic impact of development but to help reduce current levels of congestion by thinking wider than just the development area	Transport package and S106 proposals can only mitigate the impacts arising from new development	None considered necessary
	Request the removal of the unnecessary blanket restriction on cul-de-sac in para 5.5 and the table on page 23, as they offer acceptable urban design solutions	Noted. Intention of this principle was not a blanket ban on such proposals but an attempt to avoid a pre-dominance of such proposals, which across the district have caused issues for new and existing residents. Amend wording to reflect acceptability of such solutions in the appropriate circumstances.	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Section 5. Access & Movement, Principle 5.5 amend: <i><b>"Rear access, rear courtyards and cul-de-sacs will be permissible where it can be demonstrated they are appropriate in their context, part of a range of parking solutions across a development, and offer benefits to the form and layout of development."</b></i>
	Vital that provision is maintained within the highway network for Airbus component transfer activities.	Noted	None considered necessary
	Concern over impact of additional traffic specifically on	Transport modelling undertaken investigates the impact on this road and this consideration forms part of the transport package	None considered necessary

	the B4055		
	Concern that traffic modelling does not reflect seasonal variances e.g. holiday periods, and that UWE stadium development will increase traffic on A38	Traffic modelling has been undertaken in accordance with best practice	None considered necessary
	Landowners latest Framework Plan shows 'possible link' from airfield to Merlin Rd crossing land within Baylis Estate ownership – consideration should not be excluded but needs to be subject of careful analysis.	Noted	None necessary
	Roads within development need to be wide enough to ensure on-street parking does not cause road blockages	Noted, detailed proposals will be considered as part of planning applications	None considered necessary
	This strategic location gives a dimension to the planning of movement that is not currently reflected in the SPD, as this currently concentrates on movement to and from the development.	SPD is intended to set out requirements for development of Cribbs/ Patchway New Neighbourhood, not set strategic transport policy/ proposals for the wider north fringe of Bristol.	None considered necessary
	Highways Agency support sustainable development provided full transport package can be delivered	Noted	None considered necessary
	Highways Agency welcome the omission of expansion of	Noted	None considered necessary

	the Mall from the SPD, but raise concern that without retail development the previously identified funding shortfall will be even greater.		
	Highways Agency raise concern relating to local road improvements if they remove bottlenecks that currently hold back traffic from the Strategic Road Network (SRN)	Noted. Traffic modelling indicates mitigation can be undertaken without detriment to the SRN	None considered necessary
	Highways Agency seek clarity on timing/ delivery of transport package	SPD sets out timing of infrastructure elements in relation to development build out.	None considered necessary
	Transport schemes must not be purely developer led or created ad hoc. A strategic approach taken towards this issue with a clear mitigation package for the entire North Bristol road network included within the SPD.	The need for a strategic approach is recognised but the development area and SPD document are only part of the picture. It has to take account of and integrate with wider transport plans and strategies.	None considered necessary
	Fully support creation of a third inbound lane on the A4018 to accommodate a designated bus corridor	Noted	None considered necessary
	Network Rail note closure of existing level crossings will be priority, and request early engagement regarding	Noted	None considered necessary

	alternative crossings over the railway line		
	It should be made a core principle that transport improvements are established well in advance of completion of this vast housing estate.	Agreed that transport improvements need to be phased with development and completed in advance of housing completion.	None considered necessary
	Would like to see greater emphasis and a commitment to finding funding to invest in rail and realising the second phase of MetroWest.	Agreed that passenger rail can help reduce car usage and that it will need funding support. Development within the area can assist with the development of station sites etc but the SPD is not the primary document or delivery mechanism for new rail infrastructure	None considered necessary
<b>MAINTAIN &amp; IMPROVE ENVIRONMENT QUALITY &amp; ASSETS</b>	Part of site around Wyck Beck Road may be of archaeological interest in relation to the Poyntz family	Noted. This will be picked up in the planning permission conditions regarding archaeological investigations.	None considered necessary
	GI/ BI within housing areas - this section is extremely confusing. It mixes very broad and generic statements with some very specific recommendations.	The section is intended to set broad principles but necessarily there are areas of specific interest that are worthy of note.	None considered necessary
	We are unsure of the meaning of the reference on page 47 "SW corner of allocation/ rugby clubs". Please clarify.	The area referred to is the south west corner of the Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhood, where Clifton and Saracens Rugby Clubs and the Axa/ Sunlife club are currently located	None considered necessary
	Request support to continue historical research of the wider area	Noted	None considered necessary

	<p>The extent of Green Infrastructure shown in the current version of the Supplementary Planning Document will render it impossible to achieve the housing target set for the CPNN.</p>	<p>SPD diagrams are illustrative of key principles and not intended to be fixed masterplans</p>	<p>None considered necessary</p>
	<p>Saracens RFC request confirmation that if they remain in their current location and potentially lose a pitch due to the Skanska development, the Council would ensure that a third pitch is made available.</p>	<p>Planning policy presumes that existing facilities should not be lost, but that if they are then an equal amount and quality of provision is made elsewhere to mitigate the original loss.</p>	<p>None considered necessary</p>
	<p>Suggest that the third paragraph of the 'Green Infrastructure' introduction replaces the phrase 'in order to comply with CS2...' with: '...creating a robust multi-functional landscape, in accordance with CS2 and Forest of Avon objectives.'</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p><b>Proposed modification:</b> Section 4. Green and Blue Infrastructure p.40 insert: <b>"...creating a robust, multi-functional landscape in accordance with CS2 and the Forest of Avon objectives."</b></p>
	<p>Given the proximity of the Haw Wood area to the motorway there should be greater emphasis in the text about the need for strategic woodland planting that also helps to mitigate the visual, pollution and noise impacts of the motorway.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p><b>Proposed modification:</b> Section 4. Green and Blue Infrastructure, Haw Wood Area p.40 insert: <b>"...to support BAP priority species and mitigate the visual, noise and pollution impacts."</b></p>

	Suggest principle 7.2 could be rephrased as: 'Enhance and extend the landscape features...'	Agreed	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Section 4. Green and Blue Infrastructure Principle 7.3 insert: <i>"Enhance <b>and extend</b> the landscape features identified above... "</i>
	If no new principle can be added start of Principle 7.7 could be amended to: 'Promote a cohesive, high quality...'	Agreed	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Section 4. Green and Blue Infrastructure Principle 7.7insert: <i>"Promote <b>a cohesive and high quality public and private landscape...</b>"</i>
	Object to destruction of Haw Wood and the river feeding the River Trym	Haw Wood will not be affected; the woodland is outside the development area	None considered necessary
	Support SPD proposals to extend Haw Wood	Noted	None considered necessary
	Principle 7.7 "...will be viewed favourably..." inconsistent with pages 40 and 42 which require "... an holistic approach and ...it will include ..."	Pages 40-52 set out the main objectives for strategic areas of green and blue infrastructure, reinforcing and enhancing existing distinctiveness and creating new distinct areas. Principle 7.7 promotes landscape proposals that assist in developing distinctiveness. They are complimentary and not considered to be inconsistent.	None considered necessary
	Suggest increasing the amount of woodland shown on the Skanska proposals and decrease the amount of housing, to accord with the SPD diagram	Noted. Balance needs to be struck between amount of woodland provision and need to deliver housing. Proposals will be considered as part of planning applications	None considered necessary

	Pleased that rugby clubs are staying – some provision of open space	Noted	None considered necessary
	Including the plans of Clifton RFC within the SPD would mean that the club could provide much of the green space and sports facilities required within the new neighbourhood	Clifton RFC are within the new neighbourhood boundary and any detailed proposals as part of a planning application will be viewed in the context of how they contribute to the overall objectives for this development	None considered necessary
	Clifton RFC will not permit its land and facilities to be included as supporting sport/recreation for the wider area without recognition of the value that such provision brings to the development	Noted	None considered necessary
	Clifton RFC are willing partners in the overall masterplan but require absolute clarity on how its participation will be recognised in the value it brings in environmental, social and economic terms before the SPD is adopted	Clifton RFC are within the new neighbourhood boundary and any detailed proposals as part of a planning application will be viewed in the context of how they contribute to the overall objectives for this development	None considered necessary
	Object to loss of Green Belt	Considered as part of Core Strategy Examination and endorsed by Inspector.	None considered necessary
	Request loss of green belt is balanced with designation of new green belt elsewhere in the district	This is outside the scope of a Supplementary Planning Document	None considered necessary
	Area of open space to the north of The Mall should be removed	Areas of open space to north and south of The Mall illustrate the principle of improved public realm around the Mall and wider Cribbs Causeway area, and support the pedestrian/	None considered necessary



		cycle connections indicated on the Access & Movement diagram. The diagrams are illustrative of key principles and not intended to be fixed.	
	Section 6 Page 30 – Names of Haw Wood and Henbury Trym as local centres are confusing. Confusion is with ecological areas.	Noted, although the diagrams for both Community, and Green/ Blue Infrastructure sections highlight the area each name refers to	None considered necessary
	Section 7 Green and Blue Infrastructure there is reference to “natural/semi-natural environment “designated and protected for wildlife”.... without any indication of exactly how those spaces will be designated, what the level of protection will be in planning terms and where the boundaries of those spaces will be.	Noted, this is misleading as it alludes to a designation in planning terms, which is not the intention (although the aspiration is that these areas could be designated in the future). Amend wording	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Section 7, Table, Natural and Semi-Natural open space, amend: <i>“Well managed accessible natural/ semi-natural environment, intended for wildlife enhancement and managed to encourage...”</i>
	Map, page 59, It is impossible for residents and local organisations to determine the meaning and use of the term ‘strategic. Needs a much clearer definition.	Strategic Green Infrastructure, as annotated on this plan, indicates the main areas of landscape and open space where the bulk of green and blue infrastructure (defined in Section 7) will be accommodated.	None considered necessary
	Require the need for flood mitigations to be explicit within the SPD itself. These mitigations should be able to handle water levels far in	Core Strategy policy deals with requirements for flood risk mitigation as part of planning applications. SPD seeks to maximise the opportunity for landscape proposals to be multi-functional, addressing flood risk issues as well as ecology, biodiversity, landscaping, amenity and climate change.	None considered necessary

	excess of current levels to take into account the increasingly changeable weather conditions.		
	Concern over implications of development on flooding to properties in Bristol (adjacent to the railway line)	Noted. This will be covered by Flood Risk Assessments required as part of each planning application and the development of the composite master plan. As required by the Water Act and EA, each development will be required to provide an overall water strategy for the site, to ensure the development does not impact on existing built environment further down the Trym watercourse.	None considered necessary
	Support proposals but concern at Pen Park Hole and water courses – follow water course back to Winterbourne to assess impacts.	Noted	None considered necessary
	Clarification needed. Seek assurances that flood risk will not increase near Passage Road and down stream. Technical assessments do not appear, but need to be, joined up.	As above this will be covered by Flood Risk Assessments required as part of each planning application and the development of the composite master plan. As required by the Water Act and EA, each development will be required to provide an overall water strategy for the site, to ensure the development does not impact on existing built environment further down the Trym watercourse.	None considered necessary
	Concern that management of SUDs will be entirely at discretion of developers. There needs to be a long term and financially sustainable operational system specified.	Noted. Details of management for SUDs will be considered through individual applications	None considered necessary
	Recognition should be given to the Brabazon Hangars as	Noted. Brabazon hangar does not form part of this allocation and is within the administrative boundary of Bristol Cit Council.	None considered necessary

	local aviation heritage assets		
	Strongly support the reference to 'Forest of Avon objectives' and again to the 'Forest of Avon Plan'	Noted	None considered necessary
	SPD needs to be explicit in how GI/ BI is going to be integrated across the proposed development site in landscape terms and place greater emphasis on the role of landscape as part of GI as well as its ecological and recreational role	The Section 7 Green and Blue Infrastructure sets out in detail how this is to be achieved.	None considered necessary
	At an appropriate stage the Forest of Avon Trust could work with partners to practically help the Haw Wood [Skanska] proposals, and tree/ woodland proposals more widely, be delivered. We would also wish to contribute to the content of any strategic landscape/ GI plan for the proposed development site.	Noted and welcomed .Will be subject to further discussion with the Forest of Avon Trust. Potential land ownership issues to be resolved.	None considered necessary
	More emphasis needs to be made to street trees and planting in car parks, the need for trees within SUDS	Noted. Consideration given to how such proposals could be incorporated within Section 7	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Section 7, Principle 7.7 insert: <i>Using street trees and appropriate planting in areas of car parking, and incorporating street trees into SUDs proposals</i>

	schemes and flood attenuation, and a target for the tree canopy cover		
	There should be no intrusion on to Charlton Common. If cleared the common could be a huge asset to surrounding residents. SPD to state Protection and recognition of Charlton Common.	There are no proposals to develop Charlton Common, which is to be retained as part of the wider green infrastructure network. GI diagram recognises Charlton Common as existing Green Infrastructure, consider additional text to clarify.	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Section 7, Destination Park insert: <b><i>Protection and enhancement of Charlton Common as part of wider green infrastructure network</i></b>
	Provision should be made for small 'doorstop' places where it is possible for children to play and kick a ball about	Principle 5.7 seeks to control and manage access through the use of homezone principles, where streets are designed as multi-functional spaces	None considered necessary
	Existing pond on east side of A38 should be retained and developed as a wildlife area, including viewing platform	Pond lies outside the allocation boundary, but could form part of SUDs/ drainage proposals for the wider area. Will be considered as part of individual planning applications	None considered necessary
	Concerned about long term impact on cemetery capacity in Almondsbury and Patchway Councils. Recommend provision is made with the SPD for an area of land suitable for use as a cemetery or alternatively require developers to make a financial contribution to for provision in Almondsbury or Patchway	Open space audit that forms part of Infrastructure Delivery Plan did not identify additional requirement for cemeteries.	None considered necessary
	Resolution needed between developer proposals and SPD proposals for land for west of	Noted. Consider amendments to Green and Blue Infrastructure diagram	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Amend Green and Blue Infrastructure diagram to show narrower area of woodland extension adjacent to M5.

	A4018, specifically the landscape buffer to the motorway.		
	Would prefer to see development pulled away from edge of Haw Wood and buffer established to protect it.	Acceptability of details will be considered as part of individual planning applications	None considered necessary
	Future management of and access to Haw Wood needs resolution prior to development	Haw Wood lies outside the allocation boundary and is not subject to any development proposals	None considered necessary
	GI section needs bullet point re: creating ponds to deal with run-off and potential use for wildlife purposes in Haw Wood area	Principle of SUDs and ecological benefits in the Haw Wood [Skanska] area is incorporated within Section 7: Green and Blue Infrastructure	None considered necessary
	How is the Henbury Trym trail expected to continue to Henbury?	Proposals set out in Section 7 show green infrastructure links extending to the southern boundary of the allocation, following discussion with Bristol City Council officers, allowing the potential for links to be made southwards, towards the Blaise Estate	None considered necessary
	The CPNN Partners have produced an overarching POS and Sports provision report for the whole new neighbourhood, which demonstrates on over provision of POS and better, more sustainable POS and Sports facilities.	Noted and this is welcomed but offices have not seen or been able to scrutinise this report.	None considered necessary
	Sport England consider proposals should be underpinned by a district-wide Playing Pitch Strategy.	South Glos Playing Pitch Strategy is in production but will not be ready prior to this SPD being considered for adoption	None considered necessary

	Sport England note that the it is not clear from the SPD the mix of pitches/ sports being provided within the Outdoor Sports Provision category	No detailed mix is proposed at this stage, the SPD sets out the total amount of space required, generated by the development of approximately 5,700 dwellings	None considered necessary
	There is no ecological justification for a 50m minimum buffer to the Henbury Trym	The 50m is intended to provide sufficient area for a combination of uses and functions to be carried out, principally to maintain and significantly enhance the stream and adjacent area for ecological/ wildlife purposes, whilst also allowing sufficient space for its role as a pedestrian/ cycle movement corridor.	None considered necessary
	Reword para 7.6 to require a 'net gain of biodiversity' across the site rather than 'enhance where possible', in order to be consistent with Core Strategy policy CS2	Agreed	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Section 7, Principle 7.6 insert: <i>Proposals must show how they have retained the existing biodiversity and created a net gain in biodiversity across the site</i>
	Term 'grey water treatment' needs to be defined (p.16)	Agreed. Amend sentence	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Section 4, p.16 amend: <i>Strategic Green and Blue Infrastructure will need to comprise a substantial, interconnected and multi-functional network of open spaces (both green and blue assets, protecting and enhancing the existing ecological habitats, trees and hedgerows, and their integration through the use of SUDS and the treatment of waste water from buildings.</i>
	Request that proposals adjacent to railway line consider the following at design stage to eliminate risks to railway operations:  - surface water should not be discharged onto Network Rail land, no SUDs/ soakaways to be constructed within 20m of rail boundary	Noted, and all details can be used in the consideration of planning applications	None considered necessary

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- all new buildings to be constructed min 6m from boundary fence</li> <li>- design of development should take into account possible effects of noise. Vibration and generation of airborne dust</li> <li>- Network Rail to be consulted on alterations to ground levels</li> <li>- new trees adjacent to rail line should be planted not less than their mature height from boundary fence</li> </ul>		
	Principle of green link through Baylis Estate Ltd land (behind the Venue as shown on GI diagram, p.48) supported in principle but needs to align with future development on site and should reflect quantum of development that could be brought forward under the extant consent for this site.	Noted, although SPD diagrams are indicative of key principles only. The Green and Blue Infrastructure diagram does not seek to define the extent of links across the area	None considered necessary
	English Heritage consider the SPD is missing an overarching summary of the heritage and significance of the area.	Noted. Consider amendment to Section 3 Site Context & Characteristics	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Section 3, p.12
	Reference should also be made in 8.12 to Aircraft Hangar (16U) and Pillbox at Filton Airfield now being listed	Noted	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Section 8, principle 8.12 add: “The group of buildings identified include <b>four Grade II listed buildings/ structures...</b> ”

	Grade II.		
<b>MINIMISE CONSUMPTION OF NATURAL RESOURCES</b>	Should clarify how many of the properties (either commercial or private) will have solar panels fitted automatically.	Section 9 Utilities & Renewable Energy sets out principles for renewable energy provision as part of development, and has now been amended.	<p><b>Proposed modification:</b>  Section 9, p.60 amend:  <i>In relation to low carbon and renewable technologies it also recommends a combination of technologies that suit specific areas of development, such as localised <b>Combined Heat and Power (CHP)</b> for high density areas, <b>solar photovoltaic (PV)</b>, solar water heating and ground source heat pumps for lower density areas.</i></p> <p>Section 9, p.62 add:  <b><i>In terms of energy efficiency it is recommended that;</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b><i>the potential for solar gain be optimised in all buildings by considering building and roof orientation, overshadowing and materials selection,</i></b></li> <li>- <b><i>buildings should be well insulated;</i></b></li> <li>- <b><i>measures to avoid risk of overheating should be considered where buildings are well-insulated and designed to optimise solar gain;</i></b></li> <li>- <b><i>buildings should be designed to incorporate shading where appropriate and natural ventilation to the main living areas, with mechanical extraction for bathrooms and kitchens;</i></b></li> <li>- <b><i>a high % of dedicated energy efficient light fittings are installed,</i></b></li> <li>- <b><i>dedicated energy efficient light fittings or security lighting with movement detectors and daylight shut-off devices are provided,</i></b></li> <li>- <b><i>the need for a tumble dryer be removed by installing purpose made drying facilities in the form of a drying cupboard with appropriate heating and ventilation, and external facilities to dry clothes for example a clothes dryer or washing line,</i></b></li> <li>- <b><i>provision is made for gardens appropriate for growing vegetables or allotments,</i></b></li> <li>- <b><i>provision is made for a community space or forum within the development suitable for a regular farmer's market</i></b></li> <li>- <b><i>provision be made each dwelling for safe and secure storage for an appropriate number of bikes,</i></b></li> <li>- <b><i>space and services for a home office are provided, as well as a modern fibre communications network</i></b></li> </ul>



			<p><i>In relation to low carbon and renewable energy technologies it is recommended that;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Opportunities to accommodate localised CHP and district heating networks, in higher density areas, are maximised;</i></li> <li>- <i>Solar Thermal Water Heating (STWH) or Solar Photovoltaic (PV) panels should be fitted as a standard measure in all dwellings with roofs facing between south-west and south-east,</i></li> <li>- <i>LED street lighting is provided</i></li> <li>- <i>the controls and temperature readouts should be located in a prominent position within the living area of dwellings</i></li> <li>- <i>installation of PV panels should be considered on non-residential buildings,</i></li> <li>- <i>wind turbines are considered for installation at the Primary and Secondary Schools</i></li> <li>- <i>the use of ground source heat pumps be considered in lower density areas of the new neighbourhood and in any affordable or social housing,</i></li> <li>- <i>Biomass be considered for use in larger dwellings, commercial buildings and for CHP</i></li> </ul>
	Developers must be mandated to include grey and/ or rainwater recycling into new development	See proposed amendments above	See above
	No mention of sustainable lighting or of light pollution. Needs to be a statement specifying that all lighting should be directional and not allow light pollution to occur. Should apply to construction lighting, floodlighting of sports and recreational areas and to creative lighting.	See proposed amendments above	See above

	Water Harvesting - Can the harvesting of water and the production of water turbine energy using the underground and surface running water be incorporated or passed on to the Environment Agency when they consider the water management requirements of the development.	Noted. Section 9 Utilities and Renewable Energy sets out the potential energy efficiency and renewable energy sources to be investigated as part of development	None considered necessary
	Commitment to zero-carbon homes is very weak in the SPD. SPD should commit to studying and reporting on providing initial infrastructure for utilisation of waste heat available from existing and planned power stations on Severnside	See proposed amendments above. Use of waste energy from Severnside was considered and discounted for reasons of feasibility & viability	See above
	Support provision of wind turbines throughout Bristol and South Glos developments	Noted	None considered necessary
<b>FORMATTING/ PRESENTATION/ DEFINITIONS/ CLARITY</b>	Difficult to distinguish between bus priorities and access junctions.	Consider amendments to diagram for clarity	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Amend Access and Movement diagram to differentiate bus priority and access junction
	Map implies MetroWest scheme ends at Henbury station	Noted	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Amend Access and Movement diagram to show potential extension of MetroWest scheme

	The dashed purple lines on "5. Access and Movement" are not on the legend, or are these the pedestrian/ cycle links?	Dashed purple lines are pedestrian/ cycle links shown in the key	None considered necessary
	Insufficient provision of cycleways shown on (Access and Movement) diagram	SPD diagrams are intended to be strategic and indicative of key principles, rather than show detailed proposals that will come through individual planning applications.  Section 5 Access and Movement sets out the principles for cycle access to and through the new neighbourhood.	None considered necessary
	Unclear whether initial Framework Diagram (p.3) relates to red line area or wider area	Diagram on p.3 is the Policy CS26 key diagram contained in the Core Strategy.	Relocate p.3 diagram to appendix with rest of Policy CS26 to avoid confusion
	Diagrams need headings so it is clear how they relate to Policy CS26/ Figure 6, what the numbers on that diagram refer to, what status they have and how they fit with existing Core Strategy policies	SPD diagrams are intended to be strategic and indicative of key principles set out in the SPD, which adds detail to Core Strategy policy	None considered necessary
	Different character and land use areas should be unambiguous to avoid confusion. Where there are overlaps the implications for policy and practical terms should be set out.	SPD diagrams are intended to be strategic and indicative of key principles, rather than show detailed proposals that will come through individual planning applications.	None considered necessary
	Information in appendix 1 should be contained in the introduction.	SPD is intended to add detail to Policy CS26 not repeat it. CS26 is incorporated into an appendix for reference only.	None considered necessary

	Duplication of information relating to site context (p.12) should removed.	Not clear from the response what information is duplicated	None considered necessary
	Repeated references to 'the site' should be altered to avoid confusion. This SPD relates to the Bristol North Fringe, made up different sites and locations, not just one site.	This SPD relates to the Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhood, not the Bristol North Fringe. Reference to the site is to the new neighbourhood allocation.	None considered necessary
	Reference to collaboration agreements implies existing businesses and landowners of small or potential redevelopment sites should be contributing to these developments and emerging new neighbourhoods. Such businesses/landowners should only be benefiting from the proposed development.	Reference to collaboration agreements is to the principal developers of the area who it is anticipated will be delivering the majority of development and supporting infrastructure. Proposals for small, individual sites outside those in the control of the principal developers will be considered on their own merits in relation to the strategic objectives of the allocation. Where appropriate/ necessary they will be required to contribute towards the infrastructure requirements set out in the SPD	None considered necessary
	There should explicitly be no direct or indirect costs imposed on existing small landowners of small/ potential development sites. In the event that such parties are expected to contribute to such matters, the expectations of such contributions should be made specific and transparent.	All development proposals will generate the need for some degree of infrastructure. When considering small, individual sites outside those in the control of the principal developers consideration will be given to the impact they generate in relation to the infrastructure requirements set out in this document, and the degree to which they accord with the strategic objectives of Policy CS26.	None considered necessary
	Clarify on Access and Movement diagram what purple dotted line is intended to represent – cycle and	Dashed purple lines are pedestrian/ cycle links shown in the key	None considered necessary

	pedestrian links to The Mall are encouraged, vehicular connection may prove unsuitable		
	Request clarification of intended land use for Baylis Estate Ltd land to rear of Venue – Land Use plan (p.58) is not clear.	SPD diagrams are intended to be strategic and indicative of key principles, rather than show detailed proposals that will come through individual planning applications.  Previous Framework Diagram in draft SPD indicated mixed/ commercial use, in recognition of extant planning permission.	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Amend Land Use diagram to show commercial development in this area in recognition of extant planning permission.
	Airfield – support development here first as a brownfield site rather than on greenfield land, which should only be developed if required	Extent and level of development at this allocation considered by the Inspector at Core Strategy examination and found sound.	None considered necessary
	Government must increase grants to local authorities who are the only trusted agency to provide for the needs of the community.	Noted	None considered necessary
<b>PLANNING ISSUES</b>	Object to proposed 'street art' - associated with urban areas which would encourage graffiti	Public art proposals incorporate a range of options and measures to engage local (communities existing and new) in the development of the area	None considered necessary

	No ambiguity on comprehensive development of CPNN - link roads must be built first to avoid piece-meal ad on. CS26 Comprehensive development means not piecemeal	Agreed, Section 4 Vision & Objectives reiterates and reinforces this policy requirement	None considered necessary
	The SPD must clearly state only up to date Community Involvement statements will be accepted from developers.	Noted. The requirements for consultation and documentation setting this out is contained within the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (reference on p. 7)	None considered necessary
	Need for tight timescales for all infrastructure delivery so it is in place as new homes are occupied	The pre-adoption draft sets out the timing and requirements for infrastructure delivery at this allocation.	None considered necessary
	Need for proper recognition of impact on north Bristol, including 'S106 monies' being made available to improve road network beyond the South Glos/ Bristol border	The impact of development on all surrounding communities has been considered through the Core Strategy examination process and proposed infrastructure requirements generated accordingly	None considered necessary
	Development is too large	Extent and level of development at this allocation considered by the Inspector at Core Strategy examination and found sound.	None considered necessary
	Conflicts in wording of SPD – provide guidance 'in detail', but also provide a 'flexible vision and broad principles'. Clarity required on status and intention of the document	<p>Section 1 Introduction &amp; Background states the document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "... will add detail to policies set out in the Core Strategy" (p.3), and</li> <li>- Set out "...in detail the need, timing, and... location of infrastructure requirements..." (p.6)</li> </ul> <p>The stated purpose of the document is to provide more detail of infrastructure delivery, within the framework of a vision and broad principles.</p>	None considered necessary

	Conflict in diagrams	SPD diagrams are intended to be strategic and indicative of key principles, rather than show detailed proposals that will come through individual planning applications.	None considered necessary, except those amendments already identified
	Royal Mail request confirmation that residential development will not be permitted on parts of the new neighbourhood either adjacent or close to the Delivery Office or that appropriate noise attenuation measures are put in place.	Noted. The intention is that the area surrounding the Royal Mail depot is for employment purposes, primarily to support the objectives of the Filton Enterprise Area, and not for residential purposes. This is indicated in the SPD diagrams.	None considered necessary
	Section 1 (p7) and 10 (p 64) state the SPD will need to be advertised for 3 months prior to final adoption. This is incorrect – the requirement is to consult after the adoption not before	Noted. Amend text	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Sections 1. Introduction & Background p.7, and 10 Summary p.64 amend: <b><i>“Once adopted the Council will need to advertise its decision to adopt the SPD...”</i></b>
	SPD wholly unclear in relation to the Landowner Framework Plan, referenced but not included within the document	The Landowner Framework Plan is the response, as part of collaborative working with each other and the Council, of the principal developers of the Cribbs/ Patchway New Neighbourhood to Core Strategy policy and the draft documents published to date. It does not form part of the Council’s policy documentation but is being considered through the Council’s ‘Concept Statement’ process	None considered necessary
	SPD lacks clear and consistent sections on how it sits with and takes forward extant planning policy for the area	Stated purpose of the SPD (p. 3 and 6) is to add detail to Core Strategy policy, and in particular set out in detail the infrastructure delivery requirements related to the allocation	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Section 1. Introduction & Background p.3 insert: <b><i>“It will add detail to policies set out in the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy, and should be read in conjunction with the Core Strategy and policies within it.”</i></b>

	Community Involvement from CPNN developers for each planning application needs to be up-to-date and information correct.	Agreed	None considered necessary
	CPNN developers note that whilst viability discussions are ongoing it will be up to the Council to decide the approach to fill any funding gap identified. To ensure ongoing viability there will be some requirement for funding solutions outside the control of the CPNN Partners	Noted	None considered necessary
	Land Use section should be brought forward and defined at the start of the document, and be explicit as to what is intended where, and specifically how existing land uses are to be treated.	The structure of the SPD is not intended to create a hierarchy of infrastructure requirements. The land use allocation is set out in Policy CS26 of the Core Strategy	None considered necessary
	Document should refer to CIL and balance between CIL and S106 contributions	This the purpose of the Council's CIL schedule, which has been published for consultation and is currently being reviewed.	None considered necessary



	Request that Almondsbury Parish Council do not suffer disbenefit through S106 agreements with developers that can not be accommodated within or by the parish.	Details of S106 agreements will be discussed as part of planning applications	None considered necessary
	SPD right to emphasise importance of correctly phased development. Essential that transport and infrastructure support implementation of employment facilities, with housing following.	Noted	None considered necessary
	Request SPD revised to acknowledge build out period will go beyond 2027	Noted, but purpose of the SPD is to set out the delivery of infrastructure required as part of development.	None considered necessary
	Request inclusion of word 'approximately' 5,700 dwellings in accordance with CS26	Noted, amendment made for consistency with policy CS26	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Section 1. Introduction & Background p.1 insert: " <i>... it will provide <b>approximately</b> 5,700 dwellings....</i> "
	Reference to viability in 'purpose of document' section would be welcomed	Noted but scheme viability issues will be considered on their merits.	None considered necessary
	Must be recognition from South Glos Council that development cannot be held up waiting for decisions on phasing, progress on matters that lie outside of developers' control, or that take place on land outside their control	Noted	None considered necessary

	Clarify the requirement for / nature of 'formal evidence' to demonstrate that delivery of infrastructure requiring collaboration between developers can be achieved. BAE Systems & Bridgehouse Capital would prefer reference to 'formal evidence' replaced with explicit reference to the emerging 'Framework Agreement'.	Officers consider the emerging Framework Agreement would constitute 'formal evidence'. However, this document is at an early stage of production and other agreements could serve the same function.	None considered necessary at this stage
	Support reference to 'sustainable' development but suggest consistent use of 'more sustainable' development to ensure realistic guidance is set for developers	Sustainable development is a well established term used in a range of policy documents from NPPF to Core Strategy. More sustainable raises issue of measurement (i.e. more sustainable than what?).	None considered necessary
	Advise that the achievement of 5,700 dwellings be clearly stated as the principal objective in the SPD	Noted. Amend 'Purpose of the Document', p. 6	<b>Proposed modification:</b> P.6 first paragraph, insert: <i>"The allocation of the Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhood is set out in the Core Strategy (Policy CS26), and is intended to ensure the delivery of approximately 5,700 dwellings. This document is intended to ..."</i>
<b>OTHER/ GENERAL</b>	Needs own identity name related to its geography: e.g. Charlton village, New Charlton	Noted, but this is not the role of the SPD	None considered necessary

	The SPD needs to be read in conjunction with the Core Strategy which is yet to be published, although available on line. No hard copies of SPD or Core strategy were made available for North Bristol communities. For this reason we believe the consultation for the SPD process has failed.	Core Strategy is now adopted, online and hard copies available in one stop shops and libraries around the district. The SPD is also available online, with hard copies placed in all South Gloucestershire public libraries, one stop shops and the Council offices, as well as Henbury, Southmead and Westbury-on-Trym libraries.	None considered necessary
	Support the development but with caveat that environment and quality of life are maintained	Noted	None considered necessary
	Ensure dwelling design have adequate outside space	Noted but will form part of consideration of planning applications	None considered necessary
	Request commitment from the Council that once things move on from the SPD stage the resources and long-term commitment from the Council are in place to ensure new neighbourhood is delivered in a strategic, phased, comprehensive way	Noted	None considered necessary
	What is the Council study identifying the potential for fibre-optic broadband in the area?	Response given direct to enquiry.	None considered necessary

	High quality broadband should be included as a necessity	Noted, Section 9 Utilities & Renewable Energy sets out potential for broadband provision	None considered necessary
	Support protection of Air Ambulance on-site, and request this is not moved off-site.	Noted	None considered necessary
	We understand that a new drainage system has to be constructed across North Bristol. The SPD needs to state that this will be done prior to 5700 new homes are constructed and not allow piecemeal development additions, which will saturate neighbouring homes.	Wessex Water confirm that whilst a strategic solution will be required two options are still under investigation, and there is sufficient capacity in the network to accommodate development at Cribbs/ Patchway	None considered necessary
	Query implications of development on sewage capacity and specifically links with the Avonmouth Treatment Works - will there be disruption of service? Will treatment works need extending to increase capacity?	Wessex Water confirm that a long term solution will be required but that interim measures can accommodate development proposed	None considered necessary
	Section 9 re: gas, electricity and water provision needs clarification and more detail on acceptability of proposals.	Section 9 sets out the broad aspirations for these utilities	None considered necessary

	Would like to see co-operation between South Glos and Bristol Councils with a view to sharing information, lessons learnt etc	There is ongoing liaison between Council officers and members.	None considered necessary
	SPD should elaborate and support inclusion of resident-based housing co-operatives and co-operative self-builds	Principle 8.1 includes the potential for identification of land and provision of serviced plots for individuals and groups wishing to build their own home and community facilities.	None considered necessary
	Great Western Air Ambulance Service (GWAAC) & Avon & Somerset Police (A&SP) support inclusion of reference to emergency services, and request additional wording to ensure any re-provision of their services is of an acceptable design and specification to GWAAC and A&SP.	Noted although this is implicit since the continued operation of these services could not be achieved if new facilities were not of an acceptable design and specification.	None considered necessary
	Principal landowners/ developers at Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhood consider SPD should be explicit that diagrams are indicative of key principles and are not to be treated as masterplans -	Agreed	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Each Section insert: <i>"Proposals must demonstrate how they will adhere to the following key principles, and as illustrated on the indicative diagram"</i>
	Under 'Purpose of Document' add "Development proposals will be asked <b>to clarify where they differ</b> from the SPD"	Agreed	<b>Proposed modification:</b> Section 1. Introduction & Background p.6 insert: <i>"Development proposals will be asked <b>to clarify where they differ</b> from the SPD"</i>