Bath & North East Somerset Council

Improving People's Lives

Representation Summary Report
Local Plan Options

Introduction

This report provides an overview of the representations received during the Local Plan Options - Regulation 18 consultation, which took place from 12th February to 8th April 2024, with an extension until 16th April 2024. The consultation aimed to gather public input on future development needs, including housing, jobs, and policies addressing climate and ecological emergencies.

We received over 7,000 representations, demonstrating significant public engagement. This feedback will be instrumental in shaping the Draft Local Plan, ensuring it aligns with the community's needs and aspirations.

This summary has been generated through artificial intelligence (AI) to help group and extract statistics. Officers have read each representation and have reviewed the AI-generated outputs in this report. There are a small number of longer representations currently under review by Officers. Should these change the outputs of the AI analysis, a revised version of the report will be published.

The summary of representations is organised according to the plan order.

Contents

Chapters 1 to 4

Spatial priorities for the Local Plan

Addressing Housing Needs and Affordability (48 respondents, 55%): clearly justified strategy for the distribution of both market and affordable homes is key to resolving the housing crisis and improving the district's economic stance without compromising sustainability or addressing specific demographic needs.

Transportation and Connectivity Enhancement (43 respondents, 49%): Development of a comprehensive transport strategy is crucial for improved connectivity and support of sustainable travel, and should align with housing developments for the creation of interconnected communities.

Climate Resilience and Environmental Protection (40 respondents, 46%): Emphasis on mitigating climate change through sustainable infrastructure is essential, as is the support for local food growing strategies and regenerative farming for biodiversity and carbon footprint reduction while protecting valued landscapes and green spaces.

Economic Development and Employment Opportunities (37 respondents, 43%): Local plans should encourage economic growth by providing local jobs/employment space and supporting businesses, particularly in STEM fields and rural economies, alongside housing developments.

Biodiversity and Natural Asset Protection (27 respondents, 31%): support for the enhancement of biodiversity through ecological networks and conservation policies, encouraging development in urban areas to preserve natural spaces, supported by regular nature wealth assessments.

Accessibility and Social Inclusion (20 respondents, 23%): Plans should consider social contexts to ensure developments are inclusive and provide affordable access to healthy local foods, fostering socially sustainable communities.

Heritage and Cultural Conservation vs Development (13 respondents, 15%): There is a need for a balanced approach that respects heritage and green spaces preservation whilst accommodating development needs for infrastructure and housing.

Social Infrastructure and Community Services (9 respondents, 10%): The provision of social infrastructure, such as healthcare and education, should be integrated with new housing developments to improve health and well-being.

Needs that our Local Plan must address

Housing affordability and supply (34 respondents, 58%): Increase overall housing supply focusing on affordability; a variety of housing types needed for diverse demographics and economics. Some criticism of the plan's provisions and methodology for calculating needs; affordability should also considered in terms of running costs and accessibility.

Transportation and connectivity (27 respondents, 46%): Enhance public transport, park and ride facilities, and non-vehicle mobility to support developments and reduce congestion. Concerns about sufficiency of current and planned transport infrastructure.

Infrastructure and public services (25 respondents, 42%): Improve adequacy of existing infrastructure, including healthcare, schools, and utilities, to support developments. Improve public transport options and ensure infrastructure sufficiency in new housing areas.

Regional collaboration and strategic planning (24 respondents, 41%): Improved cooperation between neighbouring authorities needed for addressing shared housing needs and strategic goals. Accommodate housing demands from surrounding areas in support of regional development.

Climate change and environmental sustainability (22 respondents, 37%): Integrate climate resilience and sustainability into planning. Prioritise green spaces, sustainable transport, and brownfield sites use; address potential climate change impacts on housing.

Economic development and employment (17 respondents, 29%): Connect housing development with economic growth and employment opportunities. Focus on area regeneration, support local businesses, and strategic development location for job market access.

Heritage, culture, and community well-being (11 respondents, 19%): Balance development with the protection of heritage and culture; promote community health and well-being, as well as amenities for active lifestyles.

Demographic trends and housing diversification (8 respondents, 14%): Anticipate and respond to changing demographic patterns. Develop adaptable housing for an ageing population and diverse housing preferences.

Social infrastructure and services (7 respondents, 12%): Ensure new developments have adequate social infrastructure; address overcrowding and strain on services, including schools and healthcare facilities, to match population growth.

Collaboration and community engagement (1 respondent, 2%): Engage community in planning to ensure developments meet local needs; calls for more inclusive consultation processes and evidence-based planning decisions.

Land availability and HELAA

Green Belt Management and Strategic Land Release (41 respondents, 47%): Some support for releasing green belt land to meet housing needs, while others worry about losing green spaces and environmental impacts. Agreement exists on the necessity for justification and careful consideration in green belt development, aiming for growth that preserves the natural landscape.

Focus on Brownfield Sites (40 respondents, 45%): Strong support to prioritise brownfield sites for development, balancing environmental concerns. Issues raised about the availability and suitability of such sites, pointing to a need for thorough assessment and innovation to maximise their use for housing and commercial purposes.

Affordable Housing Crisis (30 respondents, 34%): An acute shortage of affordable housing is identified, with a call for the local plan to allocate sites for homes at diverse price points, highlighting the needs of lower and middle-income families, as well as providing options for first-time buyers and someone downsizing.

Preservation vs Development Trade-offs (30 respondents, 34%): Interest shown in balancing the preservation of historical, cultural, and environmental assets with the need for development. Suggestions made for development that respects the district's heritage and enhances its character.

Sustainable Development and Infrastructure (24 respondents, 27%): Emphasis on sustainable development near existing settlements and transport links to minimise car use/environmental footprint. Additional investment in public transport and active travel infrastructure is advocated to support new developments and improve accessibility.

Addressing Climate Change and Environmental Concerns (14 respondents, 16%): Awareness for including climate resilience and environmental sustainability in planning, with calls for green infrastructure, sustainable drainage systems, and biodiversity considerations that reduce carbon emissions.

Economic Development and Employment Opportunities (10 respondents, 11%): Emphasis on housing growth aligning with job creation, suggesting that strategic site selection should foster economic development and provide local employment opportunities, proposing employment hubs and commercial development.

Consultation and Community Engagement (3 respondents, 3%): Dissatisfaction with the consultation process indicated, noting the need for more meaningful engagement with communities to ensure development meets local needs and respects resident opinions and preferences.

Housing Diversity and Demographic Needs (1 respondent, 1%): Necessity for a housing stock that caters for various demographic needs, including specialist housing for older people, family homes, and student accommodation.

Flood Risk Management and Environmental Protection (1 respondent, 1%): Concerns mentioned about development in flood-prone areas, stressing the importance of robust environmental assessments and planning to manage flood risks and prevent environmental degradation.

Infrastructure provision, challenges and opportunities

Infrastructure Adequacy and Enhancement (49 respondents, 69%): Observations on utilities' deficiencies and the need for infrastructure upgrades to support growth.

Transport and Connectivity (35 respondents, 49%): Importance of sustainable transport to reduce car dependence and connect new developments to transport corridors.

Green Belt and Environmental Conservation (28 respondents, 39%): Discussion on the balance between green belt conservation and the need for strategic housing development.

Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity (18 respondents, 25%): Recognition of the need for urban green spaces, sustainable drainage, and preserving biodiversity.

Balancing Development and Agricultural Preservation (14 respondents, 20%): Support for protecting prime agricultural land alongside development, adhering to national guidelines.

Climate Change and Sustainable Development (13 respondents, 18%): Calls for incorporating climate mitigation into development plans, aiming towards net zero carbon goals.

Affordable Housing and Spatial Equity (13 respondents, 18%): The need for strategic planning for affordable housing distribution to meet social and economic needs.

Collaborative Planning and Community Engagement (8 respondents, 11%): Desire for transparent planning processes that include public consultation and regional collaboration.

Healthcare and Community Infrastructure (7 respondents, 10%): Calls for integrating healthcare facilities in new developments to cope with growing populations.

Heritage and Cultural Preservation (1 respondent, 1%): Concern over the impact of development on cultural heritage and the need for its protection.

Chapter 5: Bath and it's Environs

Bath overview

Transport and Connectivity Improvements (37 respondents, 39%): Critique of current public transport with suggestions for better cycling infrastructure, pedestrianisation, and improved connections to reduce car reliance.

Brownfield vs Green Belt Development (34 respondents, 36%): Focus on brownfield site development while considering the potential release of green belt land, highlighting growth and conservation/World Heritage Site (WHS) concerns.

Housing Affordability and Diversity (32 respondents, 34%): Call for more affordable housing and various solutions amidst issues of resident displacement due to investment properties.

Support for Local Amenities and Infrastructure (32 respondents, 34%): Suggestions for ensuring new developments include necessary infrastructure like healthcare, schools, and community amenities.

Sustainable and Green Development (24 respondents, 26%): Emphasis on eco-friendly housing solutions, green space protection and development plans that incorporate climate resilience.

Historic Preservation vs Development Needs (21 respondents, 22%): Discussion about balancing the preservation of Bath's heritage with the modern development demands.

Community Engagement and Social Equity (15 respondents, 16%): Desire for increased community involvement in planning and policies addressing social disparities, such as differential council tax.

Tourism Management and Economic Diversification (8 respondents, 9%): Recognition of tourism's impact with suggestions for better management and the need to broaden Bath's economic base beyond tourism and education.

Bath: Site options overview

Environmental Conservation vs. Development Needs (39 respondents, 71%): Respondents express a need to balance housing development with conservation of Bath's natural and historical environment, prioritising brownfield over greenfield locations to secure local biodiversity and heritage.

Sustainable Urban Planning & Transport Solutions (31 respondents, 56%): Discussions centre on the importance of site selection near to the city to reduce car reliance, integrating sustainable transport, managing congestion, and considering park and ride facilities to mitigate traffic impacts.

Heritage, Culture, and Community Well-being (24 respondents, 44%): There's a noted tension between growth and preservation of Bath's heritage, proposing developments respect cultural values and repurpose spaces within these constraints without compromising the city's historic character.

Housing Crisis and Affordable Accommodation (22 respondents, 40%): The acute need for housing, particularly affordable and student accommodation, is highlighted. Calls for higher density redevelopment of under-used sites and adherence to affordable housing provisions are mentioned.

Community Engagement and Policy Revision (18 respondents, 33%): Respondents encourage more community involvement in planning, revising existing site allocations to reflect updated priorities like climate adaptation and ecological preservation.

Infrastructure and Public Services Impact (12 respondents, 22%): Concerns focus on the potential strain of new developments on existing infrastructure and public services, advocating for corresponding infrastructural enhancements.

Climate Change and Ecological Response (4 respondents, 7%): Some emphasis on aligning housing developments with climate and ecological emergencies, focusing on energy-efficiency, green infrastructure, and sustainable water management practices.

Site option: Milsom Quarter

Utilisation of Underused Spaces (8 respondents, 57%): Respondents mentioned the transformative potential of underused spaces, advocating for the conversion of car parks and the other under used spaces into vibrant urban areas.

Housing and Economic Development (6 respondents, 43%): Support was shown for affordable housing and local business stimulation, with a focus on creating pedestrian zones. Concerns about the types of development, such as hotel construction, were also mentioned.

Architectural Innovation and Public Spaces (4 respondents, 29%): There's an interest in contemporary architecture and the provision of public spaces, with considerations around the loss of community assets such as the Cattlemarket site.

Public Engagement and Planning Policies (4 respondents, 29%): Calls for greater public participation in the development process and a need for updated planning policies to meet current expectations were raised.

Biodiversity, Green Spaces, and Environmental Considerations (4 respondents, 29%): An emphasis was placed on enhancing biodiversity and sustainability within the development, reflecting a desire to improve urban living quality.

Heritage, Archaeology, and World Heritage Site Consideration (3 respondents, 21%): Protection of Bath's historical and cultural heritage, including its World Heritage Site status, was a concern among some participants.

Sustainable Transportation and Accessibility (3 respondents, 21%): The need for improved cycling infrastructure and pedestrian spaces was highlighted, along with concerns regarding vehicular access and the impact on traffic.

Site option: Bath Central Riverside

Preservation vs Development Impact (60 respondents, 65%): Balancing heritage preservation with development needs; concerns over negative impacts on World Heritage status and green spaces contrasted with potential economic benefits.

Traffic and Urban Congestion (40 respondents, 43%): Concerns about increased traffic and parking problems due to development; suggestions for improving public transport and active travel to align with clean air objectives and maintain livability.

Alternative Development Strategies (35 respondents, 38%): Suggestions for less contentious solutions include alternative locations and transport options like river taxis and park-and-rides to avoid adding to city centre congestion and preserve riverside areas.

Support for Sports and Community Activities (33 respondents, 35%): Support for enhancing Bath's sporting culture through new facilities, with emphasis on inclusive access to various sports and community uses, not just elite or commercial interests.

Economic Impact and Local Benefits (27 respondents, 29%): Expected benefits of developments include job creation and visitor attraction, yet there's scepticism about the scale of benefits and concern over potential adverse impacts on local businesses and congestion.

Architectural and Design Sensitivity (14 respondents, 15%): Calls for development that respects Bath's historical and architectural character; ensuring new structures complement rather than detract from the existing cityscape.

Environmental and Flood Risk Concerns (13 respondents, 14%): Anxiety over environmental impacts, including flood risks and pollution; suggestions for incorporating sustainable practices and mitigation measures in development plans.

Access and Use of Public Spaces (10 respondents, 11%): Desire to maintain public access to riverside areas; suggest community ownership and diverse use, with worries that development could limit access or favour particular groups.

Legal and Policy Considerations (3 respondents, 3%): Discussions on the appropriateness and potential need for amendments in policies to reflect contemporary challenges and align with sustainable and environmental objectives.

Engagement and Consultation Process (3 respondents, 3%): Calls for improved engagement with residents and stakeholders, including clearer information, more inclusive consultation, and genuine consideration of local needs in decision-making.

Site options: Manvers Street

Economic Strategy Alignment and Flexibility of Use (6 respondents, 67%): Development at Manvers Street should align with the broader economic strategy, integrating flexible property uses such as hybrid spaces catering to evolving post-COVID needs, with calls for detailed, robust planning.

Vacancy and Regeneration Needs (2 respondents, 22%): Highlighting the number of vacant shops as a regeneration challenge and opportunity, there's a need for a comprehensive policy to revitalise Manvers Street and concerns about the effectiveness of current approach.

Strategic Planning Approach (2 respondents, 22%): Participants suggest a supplementary planning document or new comprehensive policy to guide development, ensuring coordination with economic, cultural, and environmental goals.

Inclusion and Housing Options (1 respondent, 11%): There's interest in including diverse mix of housing in the development, such as accommodation for non-first year and postgraduate students, representing a call for inclusive urban development.

Heritage and Urban Development Considerations (1 respondent, 11%): Proposed developments must consider the area's World Heritage Site status, needing a balance between heritage value protection and modern development, with design codes and building parameters.

Site options: Bath Quays North

Flexibility for Future Needs (14 respondents, 93%): Versatile space use at Bath Quays North is crucial, considering changing work patterns and economic adaptability; suitable for mixed-use, startups, R&D, and hybrid models.

Land Use and Development Strategy (9 respondents, 60%): Respondents call for a comprehensive land use strategy that is adaptable for modern needs; suggestions include a new policy framework, potentially via an SPD.

Housing vs Office Space Balance (8 respondents, 53%): Varied opinions on residential versus office space ratio; some favour increased housing due to reduced office demand, while others advocate mixed use for economic vitality.

Student Accommodation Debate (4 respondents, 27%): Mixed views on Purpose-Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) at Bath Quays North; some against over-concentration, others see the need for a balanced residential mix.

R&D and Economic Growth (4 respondents, 27%): Emphasis on leveraging university presence for R&D and innovation; ideas include spaces for business incubation and enterprise support, contributing to local economic development.

Sustainable and Active Transport Integration (2 respondents, 13%): Consensus on enhancing Bath Quays North with accessible transport including walking, cycling, and bus facilities; minimal car parking to reduce congestion.

Respecting Cultural and Historical Context (1 respondent, 7%): Importance placed on development that aligns with Bath's WHS status and its heritage; calls for planning that respects the city's unique characteristics.

Environmental Protection and World Heritage Site Compatibility (1 respondent, 7%): Development should be delivered with environmental conservation in mind and be compatible with the WHS; enhancement of Bath's historic and environmental heritage is key.

Bath Quays and Riverside Court

Policy and planning approach revisions (3 respondents, 50%): Clearer policies and refined development requirements needed for flexibility, while keeping Bath's heritage intact.

Balancing residential and commercial needs (3 respondents, 50%): Residential spaces for young professionals sought, with concerns over business displacement and local economic impacts, advocating a balanced development approach.

Development flexibility and context sensitivity (3 respondents, 50%): Flexibility in policy and design urged to respect Bath's historical significance and accommodate mixed-use demands.

Transport accessibility and economic impact (2 respondents, 33%): Advantage of Riverside Court's location near transport hubs is recognized, but the shift from commercial to residential use could hinder startup support and economic diversity.

Strategic use of brownfield sites (1 respondent, 17%): Brownfield sites should be used for residential development, reflecting sustainable urban practices and environmental conservation.

Protecting and enhancing cultural heritage (1 respondent, 17%): A masterplan is needed to align development with preservation of Bath's World Heritage status, suggesting tailored planning documents for historical integrity.

Site option: South Bank

Integrated design and planning strategy (6 respondents, 75%): A coherent development respecting the South Bank's attributes through comprehensive strategies including supplementary planning documents, masterplans, design codes and building height parameters is supported.

Sustainable and ecological development (3 respondents, 38%): Integration of green infrastructure and sustainable transport is emphasized to enhance green spaces and movement, with the need for clear policy and spatial understanding to support the site's ecology and social fabric.

Economic viability and housing affordability (2 respondents, 25%): Redevelopment of brownfield sites for housing should address shortages and include affordable options, using river frontage benficially, with policies to ensure location benefits contribute to housing accessibility.

Infrastructure and accessibility (2 respondents, 25%): Maintaining essential services and outlets locally is vital to avoid increasing car usage, with a mixed-use approach recommended for preserving amenities and advancing sustainable urban living and transport modes.

Cultural and historical preservation (1 respondent, 12%): Heritage-led development should avoid harming world heritage sites, with a requirement for development that respects and enhances the site, incorporating growth and preservation.

Site option: Green Park Station West and Sydenham Park

Affordable Housing and Social Infrastructure (6 respondents, 43%): Respondents suggest prioritising affordable housing in developments at Green Park Station West and Sydenham Park, ensuring compatibility with Bath's World Heritage status without compromising the city's historical character.

Coordination between Development and Heritage Preservation (6 respondents, 43%): Discussions emphasise the need for a balance between new developments and preserving Bath's historical and environmental setting, requiring collaboration among stakeholders.

Heritage and Environment Preservation (6 respondents, 43%): Respondents place importance on preserving Bath's World Heritage site and its architectural aesthetics, highlighting the integration of new developments with the city's heritage values.

Strategic Planning and Policy Enforcement (5 respondents, 36%): Users call for strategic site-wide guidance and enforceable policies, such as building height restrictions, balancing policy framework with efficient planning processes.

Economic Viability and Diverse Needs (4 respondents, 29%): Development should be financially viable, catering to diverse housing needs beyond retirement homes, thus acknowledging the need for housing suitable for younger demographics.

Community Engagement and Local Economy Enhancement (3 respondents, 21%): Suggestions to integrate local businesses and artists within new developments, with a focus on ensuring a portion of profits benefits community initiatives, while maintaining heritage aesthetics.

Innovative Utilisation of Space (2 respondents, 14%): Ideas include repurposing Green Park Station as a local market and entertainment venue, and creatively using under utilised spaces to support local businesses and artists, enhancing the city's heritage and beauty.

Site option: Bath Riverside

Planning and Policy Considerations (6 respondents, 67%): Emphasis on comprehensive planning, including strategies and codes to respect Bath's heritage while addressing building height and visual impact in line with the World Heritage status.

Heritage Preservation vs. Modern Development (2 respondents, 22%): Discussion around balancing preservation of Bath's architectural integrity and World Heritage attributes against the needs for modernisation.

Sports and Recreation Facility Development (2 respondents, 22%): Mixed opinions on providing sports facilities at the central riverside and recreation ground, contrasting support for diverse sports with opposition to a stadium due to heritage concerns and other impacts.

Affordable and Social Housing Initiatives (2 respondents, 22%): Calls for affordable and social housing to aid local workers and community needs, contrasting with criticisms of student housing and upscale residential units.

Sustainable and Recreational Space Management (2 respondents, 22%): Focus on maintaining spaces for sport and recreation, urban greening, and wildlife, balanced against overdevelopment concerns, such as parking in low emission zones.

Incorporation of Cultural and Green Spaces (1 respondent, 11%): Interest in integrating cultural hubs with historical significance and creating wildlife-friendly green areas as part of urban greening initiatives.

Site option: Bath Press

Sustainable and Affordable Housing (5 respondents, 33%): Emphasised the need for housing that is both affordable and meets local community needs, discouraging luxury flats for non-residents.

Public Perception and Urban Aesthetics (5 respondents, 33%): Raised concerns about the visual impact of the area and the potential of the development to enhance the city's aesthetic while respecting heritage values.

Regulatory Framework and Implementation (4 respondents, 27%): Called for clear planning strategies and mechanisms to ensure on-schedule development and context-sensitive urban growth.

Green Infrastructure and Environmental Considerations (3 respondents, 20%): Acknowledged the importance of including green spaces and infrastructure, and suggested a focus on brownfield sites to preserve the natural environment.

Design Guidelines and Heritage Preservation (3 respondents, 20%): Stressed the need for strict guidelines and height restrictions to maintain the integrity of Bath's historic character and World Heritage status.

Infrastructure and Local Services Support (2 respondents, 13%): Expressed concerns over adequate infrastructure and local services to accommodate the growth from new developments.

Site option: Roseberry Place

Policy Flexibility and Site-Specific Parameters (5 respondents, 71%): Existing policies for Roseberry Place are considered too rigid; adjustments to individual parameters to better respond to site-specific demands are advocated along with allowing broader mixed-use developments in accordance with NPPF guidelines due to decreased traditional office space demand.

Residential Development and Housing Needs (4 respondents, 57%): There's a call for a shift towards residential-led development at Roseberry Place, to help meet the city's housing requirements. Suggestions include incorporating affordable and 'build to rent' housing options within a mixed-use development framework.

Economic and Employment Opportunities (3 respondents, 43%): Opinions are divided concerning Roseberry Place's role in economic and employment growth. While some foresee benefits to the city's economic health through the provision of quality living spaces for employees and support of educational sectors, others doubt the viability of non-central office spaces due to historically low demand.

Changing Work Practices and Flexible Workspace Needs (2 respondents, 29%): The effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on work practices suggests a potential for Roseberry Place to offer flexible workspaces. This caters to the trend towards remote and hybrid working arrangements, though there's scepticism about the pre-let market for new office buildings.

Urban Design and Heritage Conservation (1 respondent, 14%): Emphasis is placed on the imperative of any development at Roseberry Place being sensitive to the historic environment of Bath, implying that any growth and modernisation should maintain a balance with heritage conservation per WHS and OUV guidelines.

Education, Student Accommodation, and Mixed-Use Development (1 respondent, 14%): The suitability of Roseberry Place for educational purposes is noted, with suggestions that development should encompass student housing and mixed-use areas geared towards educational and creative uses to match the needs of nearby campuses.

Site option: Westmark Site, Windsor Bridge Road

Population Density and Local Community Impact (4 respondents, 50%): Respondents raised concerns about potential overcrowding due to high population density, stressing the need for sufficient parking. Benefits such as urban revitalisation and the introduction of non-student housing were also mentioned, indicating a chance for community enrichment.

Building Height and Aesthetics (3 respondents, 38%): The discussion centred on adhering to council policies to limit building heights at the Westmark Site, balancing the area's existing character with the need for residential development.

Protection of World Heritage Site (WHS) Values (2 respondents, 25%): Emphasis was placed on safeguarding the WHS, suggesting that developments should respect the site's heritage by adhering to specific site parameters and planning documents.

Sustainable and Context-Sensitive Planning (2 respondents, 25%): Calls for a masterplan indicated a preference for development that is congruent with the local context and sustainable, mindful of the impact on views and careful resource management.

Local Amenity Support and Accessibility (1 respondent, 12%): Suggestions were made to improve accessibility and support for local amenities, reflecting the desire for developments to contribute positively to community life and well-being.

Traffic and Infrastructure Impact (1 respondent, 12%): Concerns were voiced about the potential increase in traffic and its speed, with remedies such as low traffic neighbourhoods and parking permits being proposed. There was also an acknowledgment that such development could lead to improvements in local infrastructure and amenities.

Site option: Stable Yard Industrial Estate

Protection and Utilisation of Employment Lands (2 respondents, 67%): Users want the site to maintain its industrial use, preserving jobs and allowing similar developments, with a focus on economic stability and job security.

Strategic Planning and Regulation (1 respondent, 33%): There's a call for detailed planning, such as a supplementary planning document, tailored to the site to balance local environmental needs and historic value.

Heritage Conservation vs Developmental Needs (1 respondent, 33%): Concerns were raised about reconciling development with conserving the World Heritage Site and its Outstanding Universal Value, suggesting a master plan with design codes and height restrictions.

Clarification and Transparency in Development Terms (1 respondent, 33%): Users request clear explanations of terms like "protected from development," seeking transparent communication on how changes will impact the community and heritage sites.

Site option: Newbridge Riverside

Economic development and innovation (6 respondents, 50%): Focus on creating a business-friendly environment in Newbridge Riverside that supports a range of industries, particularly focusing on innovation and research sectors such as life sciences, biosciences, and creative industries.

Integrated urban planning and management (6 respondents, 50%): Emphasis on comprehensive urban planning for Newbridge Riverside that blends new developments with the existing cityscape and balances residential, commercial, and industrial spaces through detailed planning and management.

Transportation and mobility (3 respondents, 25%): Concerns regarding traffic congestion and the need for a thorough traffic plan to improve parking, infrastructure maintenance, and general accessibility in Newbridge Riverside.

Community and recreation needs (3 respondents, 25%): Calls for development that addresses the lifestyle needs of the community, including innovative living spaces, recreation paths for pedestrians and cyclists, and hubs for leisure and environmental activities.

Infrastructure and environmental considerations (3 respondents, 25%): Importance of developing Newbridge Riverside's infrastructure with environmental conservation in mind, addressing issues like storm management and transportation, whilst protecting green spaces.

Cultural heritage and world heritage site (1 respondent, 8%): Highlighting the need to protect the historical and cultural heritage of Newbridge Riverside, especially in relation to the nearby world heritage site.

Stakeholder engagement and collaborative governance (1 respondent, 8%): The necessity for active engagement and collaborative governance involving various stakeholders such as the university, local businesses, residents, and the local council in Newbridge Riverside's development.

Site option: Weston Island

Cultural and Arts Development (10 respondents, 67%): Focus on making Weston Island a vibrant cultural hub with art spaces, retail, and food outlets, leveraging local creative industries and Bath Spa University's proximity. Balance cultural innovation with heritage respect.

Regeneration and Community Benefit (10 respondents, 67%): Suggest mixed-use development to boost aesthetic, cultural, and economic aspects of Weston Island and Bath. Emphasise community inclusion and a diverse, vibrant spirit.

Economic and Educational Synergies (6 respondents, 40%): Point out the potential of merging creative industries with education institutions for economic development. Boost employment and foster interdisciplinary collaboration.

Inclusive Development Policies (4 respondents, 27%): Recommend developing flexible policies that support various activities and uses, adaptable to meet evolving needs with broad stakeholder benefits.

Connectivity and Access (1 respondent, 7%): Advocate for better transport connections, particularly for active travel modes, to maximise the area's potential as a cultural and leisure destination.

Site option: Twerton Park

Community and Football Club Welfare (5 respondents, 71%): Development should support the community and Bath City Football Club. The role of Twerton Park as a community asset is emphasised, with a focus on policy flexibility to enhance club sustainability and well-being.

Planning Flexibility and Local Uncertainty (4 respondents, 57%): Critique of current, restrictive planning policy at Twerton Park. A desire for adaptable strategies that account for local uncertainty and can ensure long-term interests.

Mixed-use Development and Viability (3 respondents, 43%): Mixed views on mixed-use development elements, such as student accommodation and NHS staff housing. Discussion on planning policies' compatibility with economic realities and the importance of a nuanced approach.

Protection of Heritage and Open Spaces (2 respondents, 29%): Preservation of playing fields and respect for World Heritage Site values is important. Development should be informed and balanced, safeguarding Twerton Park's historical relevance.

Strategic Planning and Development Approaches (2 respondents, 29%): Calls for comprehensive, strategic planning including a masterplan and design codes that respect Twerton Park's character and history, while addressing contemporary needs.

Regeneration and Local Investment (2 respondents, 29%): There's a call for regeneration and addressing the lack of investment in the area around Twerton Park. Development might catalyse wider socio-economic regeneration efforts.

Modernisation and Maintenance Costs (1 respondent, 14%): The need for modernisation of Twerton Park is acknowledged against the backdrop of high maintenance costs, highlighting the challenge of finding sustainable solutions.

Site option: RUH (Royal United Hospitals), Weston

Community and Staff Well-being (17 respondents, 65%): Emphasis on parking constraints and the search for affordable housing affecting both NHS staff and the local community. Proposals for better support for key workers suggest a need for a improved environment.

Balancing Housing Needs with Parking Provisions (13 respondents, 50%): Respondents provided varied perspectives on balancing the introduction of more housing with the necessity for adequate parking. Suggestions ranged from increasing parking facilities to innovative solutions like park and ride services.

Affordable Housing for NHS Workers (11 respondents, 42%): Emphasises the affordability of housing for NHS staff, noting the challenges posed by property prices, especially in Bath. Accessible accommodation is seen as crucial for staff retention and healthcare delivery.

Transport and Accessibility Solutions (10 respondents, 38%): There's an ask for improved transport options, such as park and ride or shuttle buses, tailored to reduce car use and address parking issues, aligning with the unique needs of the hospital staff, visitors, and residents.

Sustainable Development and Urban Planning (1 respondent, 4%): Calls for responsible development that considers the unique setting of RUH in Bath, proposing the creation of planning documents that recognise the importance of WHS attributes and community needs.

Impact on Local Infrastructure and Environment (1 respondent, 4%): Concerns about the effects of development on local infrastructure and the environment, proposing comprehensive planning to manage traffic, pollution, and maintain Bath's aesthetic integrity while protecting historical sites.

Site option: Hartwells Garage

Housing Needs and Student Accommodation (6 respondents, 67%): Division of opinion on whether to prioritise affordable housing for locals or student accommodation; concerns about over-saturation of student housing and calls for affordable non-student housing, particularly for key workers.

Strategic Development Approach (5 respondents, 56%): Demand for strategic, context-sensitive planning with a mix of affordable housing and considerations for WHS and OUV; suggestions for implementing an SPD and balancing developer-led planning with local needs assessments.

Traffic and Infrastructure Concerns (4 respondents, 44%): Concern over increased traffic and the adequacy of the current infrastructure; issues such as 'rat runs', parking problems, and calls for reevaluation of access routes and parking management.

Sustainability and Environmental Impact (4 respondents, 44%): Shared concern for the environmental impact with an emphasis on sustainable development; suggestions include enhancing green corridors for active travel and respecting WHS and OUV attributes.

Community and Quality of Life (4 respondents, 44%): Impact on community well-being key to discussions; focuses on affordable housing, local infrastructure improvements, and aligning development with Bath's heritage and sustainability goals.

Aesthetic and Scale Considerations (3 respondents, 33%): Some users find the proposed development aesthetically displeasing; calls for design considerations to respect local architecture and a masterplan to guide building heights and densities.

Site option: Sion Hill

Traffic, Parking, and Public Transport Improvements (40 respondents, 91%): Respondents mentioned concerns about the increase in traffic and parking difficulties due to proposed road closures and narrow roads. Suggestions include revisions to traffic management plans, increased bus service frequency, and limits on the number of cars per household to alleviate congestion.

Housing Density and Development Scale (39 respondents, 89%): Some raised issues with the potential increase in residential units leading to overdevelopment, impacting local character and amenities. Lower-density developments that respect conservation guidelines and the area's character are favoured.

Infrastructure and Road Safety (22 respondents, 50%): Respondents discussed the need for adequate infrastructure to accommodate traffic from new developments. Recommended improvements include road widening, better pavements, and enhanced sightlines at junctions for pedestrian and cyclist safety.

Environmental Impact and Preservation of Green Spaces (19 respondents, 43%): There is significant focus on preserving existing green spaces and environmental quality in Sion Hill. Ideas include protecting mature trees and wildlife habitats, and maintaining the area's charm and UNESCO World Heritage status through careful development planning.

Development Design and Aesthetics (15 respondents, 34%): Respondents advocated for architectural designs that are sympathetic to the surrounding environment, suggesting restrictions on building heights and the adoption of styles like bay windows to keep with the area's aesthetic and UNESCO status.

Affordable Housing and Demographic Considerations (7 respondents, 16%): There is a concern over housing affordability and demographic suitability. The area might not cater well to young people or families due to the focus on apartment developments. Respondents suggest a mix of affordable housing to create a diverse community.

Community Amenities and Services (2 respondents, 5%): A few respondents highlighted the demand for community facilities within the Sion Hill development, such as shops, cafes, and play areas. The enhancement of pedestrian and cycling routes is also suggested to promote sustainable transport and provide spaces for all ages.

Site option: St Martins

Environmental and Heritage Protection vs. Development Needs (3 respondents, 50%): Discussions focus on the importance of balancing development with the protection of the World Heritage Site and its Outstanding Universal Value, suggesting development should consider the site's historical and ecological legacies.

Preservation of Green Spaces and Historical Attributes (2 respondents, 33%): Respondents highlight the need to conserve green spaces and historical landmarks like St Martins Chapel and Frome House, stressing their importance for community use and heritage continuity.

Housing and Community Space Utilisation (2 respondents, 33%): There is a conversation around St Martins as a location for sustainable housing, with suggestions pointing towards development that accounts for community needs and integrates green space.

Infrastructure and Utilities Concerns (1 respondent, 17%): Issues are raised regarding the suitability of current utilities and infrastructure for future development, with concerns about how increased traffic and parking could affect the community.

Planning and Development Approaches (1 respondent, 17%): The need for specialised planning approaches, like Supplementary Planning Documents, is mentioned, aiming at protecting the WHS's integrity while accommodating sustainable development fitting the site's unique context.

Community Engagement and Accessibility to Documentation (1 respondent, 17%): Challenges are noted in accessing and understanding planning documents, highlighting the importance of transparent communication and accessible information in the planning process.

Site option: Sulis Down

Environmental and Ecological Preservation (430 respondents, 86%): Respondents stress the importance of protecting Sulis Down's natural environment, citing its status as an AONB and habitat for endangered species. There is also recognition of development needs, with suggestions for a balanced approach that better utilises brownfield sites and conserves ecology.

Housing Development Strategy (332 respondents, 67%): Acknowledging the need for housing, participants advocate for development of brownfield sites over greenfield sites such as this. There is significant support for affordable, sustainable housing that addresses local needs while minimising environmental impact.

Traffic and Infrastructure Concerns (294 respondents, 59%): Many express concerns over increased traffic and the existing road network's capacity. Concern that development will worsen congestion and pollution. Alternatives proposed include better planning and infrastructure, such as public transport and non-motor traffic enhancements.

Community and Recreational Value (234 respondents, 47%): The communal value of Sulis Down, particularly recognised during the pandemic, is highlighted. Suggestions for retaining its recreational use involve improvements to walking paths and the introduction of community gardens.

Historical and Cultural Significance (78 respondents, 16%): Development at Sulis Down is a concern for its historical and cultural importance, particularly relating to Bath's World Heritage status. Protection is advised through legal safeguards and ensuring development is sympathetic to the landscape.

Local Amenities and Services (47 respondents, 9%): There is concern that current local amenities are insufficient for an increased population. Comprehensive planning is called for, ensuring that the provision of services such as schools and healthcare can meet the demands of growth.

Climate Change and Sustainability (16 respondents, 3%): Sustainability in development to combat climate change is a point of discussion, emphasizing the importance of sustainable building practices, renewable energy use, and maintaining green spaces.

Food Security and Sustainable Agriculture (8 respondents, 2%): Some suggest Sulis Down could support UK food security through sustainable agriculture, community allotments, or food growing projects, while preserving its open space.

Site option: Englishcombe Lane

Housing Needs and Development Opportunities (7 respondents, 64%): A significant portion of feedback indicates a demand for more housing, specifically affordable options for young people and families, with the site's proximity to Bath and transport links seen as advantageous. However, concerns range from topographical issues to potential ecological loss, with a call to prioritise brownfield site development.

Site-specific Challenges and Opportunities for Sustainable Development (6 respondents, 55%): Discusses technical and environmental challenges such as land stability, water management, and traffic. Respondents suggest strategic planning and adherence to environmental frameworks, focusing on sustainable and sensitive development integrating nature conservation.

Ecological Considerations and Wildlife Preservation (5 respondents, 45%): Highlights the divide between recognising the site's ecological significance, noting habitats for rare species and the need for green space preservation, and proponents of development who may rely on mitigation measures. The discussion centres on balancing development with conservation.

Historical and Policy Considerations (5 respondents, 45%): Focuses on the site's historical context of failed developments and complex policy landscape. Calls for policy revision in light of the site's ecological value are made and the preference for developing brownfield sites is reiterated.

Community and Social Impact (2 respondents, 18%): Feedback includes suggestions for development to address specific community needs and concerns about local infrastructure adequacy for new residents. The notion of a community-managed green space represents a desire for local control and involvement.

Site option: Burlington Street

Heritage Protection and Development Impact (1 respondent, 50%): Emphasises the significance of heritage impact assessments to ensure development is balanced with heritage conservation. Advocates for clear plans that protect and enhance the heritage of the site, promoting development that is protective and contextually sensitive.

Planning and Approval Processes (1 respondent, 50%): Calls for meticulous, structured planning and approval processes with emphasis on a supplementary planning document (SPD). Highlights the necessity for development to adhere to regulatory and heritage guidelines, including UNESCO guidance for Heritage Impact Assessments (HIA) to protect World Heritage Sites (WHS) and their Outstanding Universal Value (OUV).

Site option: University of Bath

Student Accommodation Expansion (15 respondents, 79%): Views on increasing on-campus student accommodation to address student numbers and local housing market pressures, with considerations of campus capacity, local population balance, and environmental impacts.

Community Impact and Local Infrastructure (10 respondents, 53%): Concerns over university expansion's effect on Bath's affordable housing and infrastructure, with on-campus housing seen as a way to mitigate these impacts.

Campus Masterplan and Development Strategy (9 respondents, 47%): The masterplan's role in balancing future academic space, accommodation, and facilities needs against growth accommodation and transport impact management.

Sustainable Transport and Parking Solutions (9 respondents, 47%): Trade-off between reducing campus car parking and the need for eco-friendly travel options like shuttle buses, e-bike rentals, and improved public transport.

Public and Active Transport Enhancement (5 respondents, 26%): Promotion of public transport and cycling through dedicated bike routes, subsidised transport for students and integrated transport systems.

Ecological and Heritage Considerations (4 respondents, 21%): Importance of ecological impacts, particularly on local wildlife and heritage landscape, suggesting development should be sensitive and adhere to nature protection laws.

Innovative Development Solutions (3 respondents, 16%): Creative approaches including multi-storey or underground parking with housing above, and environmentally respectful redevelopment, emphasizing conservation of green spaces.

Site option: Sulis Club

Balancing Development and Environmental Protection (7 respondents, 50%): Respondents mentioned the importance of respecting the natural landscape while developing Sulis Club, including extra tree planting, controlling light pollution, and protecting local wildlife such as bats. The discussion shows the tension between progress and environmental protection.

Impact on Local Infrastructure and Quality of Life (6 respondents, 43%): Concerns were shared about how the development could affect local living conditions, with a focus on issues like light pollution from sports floodlights and the potential loss of community space. Suggestions include conducting health impact assessments to safeguard residents' quality of life.

Community Access and Sporting Value (5 respondents, 36%): Responses captured the importance of keeping or increasing public access to sports facilities. Respondents suggested maintaining the club's role in supporting community health and wellbeing, with potential expansions for broader utility.

Development Constraints and Opportunities (4 respondents, 29%): Discussions revolved around the constraints of development due to factors such as World Heritage Site status and building height regulations. Possibilities such as accommodating university car parking or new student accommodations while maintaining the area's green integrity were suggested.

Policy Compliance and Planning Considerations (4 respondents, 29%): Respondents discussed the need for development to comply with legal frameworks and policies like Sport England's Playing Fields Policy and the NPPF. Strategic planning documents that outline clear principles and preserve landscapes were advocated for.

Stakeholder Engagement and Flexibility in Use (4 respondents, 29%): There was an emphasis on engaging with various stakeholders to explore flexible uses for the site. Suggestions for making sports facilities more versatile were discussed, aiming for inclusive development strategies that accommodate diverse community needs.

Site option: Bath Spa University Newton Park Campus

Sustainability and Environmental Preservation (9 respondents, 69%): Emphasised importance of green spaces and ecological integrity, suggesting eco-friendly developments and care for natural and built environments.

Infrastructure and Facilities Development (7 respondents, 54%): Identified need for robust facilities, strategic delivery of spaces, and a masterplan respecting heritage and landscape.

Strategic Planning and Policy Alignment (7 respondents, 54%): Called for comprehensive planning documents and policies consistent with national standards and sensitive to site specifics.

Housing and Community Impact (6 respondents, 46%): Highlighted competition between student and local affordable housing, suggesting use of university land for student accommodation and community development.

Accessibility and Public Engagement (4 respondents, 31%): Proposed better public access and infrastructure, engaging community in policy discussions for inclusive decision-making.

Site: West of Bath (potential site)

Public Benefits versus Conservation (47 respondents, 63%): Some respondents highlighted development benefits, including housing and job opportunities, while others focused on the need for conservation of Bath's natural landscapes and heritage.

Heritage and Environmental Impact (46 respondents, 61%): Concerns were raised about potential damage to Bath's World Heritage status, with some suggesting that careful planning could enhance the city's historic environment.

Sustainable Development and Transport Links (44 respondents, 59%): Mixed opinions emerged about the sustainability of the site, with advantages noted for transport links potentially reducing carbon emissions, though some worried about increased traffic and urban sprawl.

Housing and Social Considerations (32 respondents, 43%): The need for affordable housing was weighed against potential loss of green spaces and impacts on local quality of life.

Community and Economic Perspectives (28 respondents, 37%): Economic benefits from development were discussed, against concerns for community cohesion and Bath's distinctive character.

Green Belt and Ecological Concerns (17 respondents, 23%): The importance of preserving green belt land for ecology was debated against the need for housing, with some considering development could be justified under exceptional circumstances.

Infrastructure and Services Enhancement (8 respondents, 11%): Some advocated improved infrastructure and services through development, while others worried about capacity and the need for investment in amenities.

Site: South of Burnett, next to A39 (potential site)

Agricultural and Environmental Concerns (329 respondents, 73%): Strong sentiment against using productive farmland for development, highlighting the ecological benefits, potential loss of biodiversity, and impacts on local and national food security. Emphasis on consistency with climate and ecological emergency declarations to preserve green belt lands.

Alternatives and Strategies for Housing Development (322 respondents, 71%): Support for a "brownfield-first" approach, utilising existing buildings and prioritising previously used sites. Calls for sustainable development strategies that include smaller scale infill, restoration, and conversion of non-residential spaces. Importance of enhancing public transport and infrastructure underscored.

Impact on Local Community and Heritage (306 respondents, 68%): Concern about the disruption to the area's rural character, its landscape, and proximity to historical sites. Concerns over eroding local village identity, traditions, and additional strain on local services, altering life quality for residents.

Infrastructure and Transport Challenges (294 respondents, 65%): Concerns about inadequate existing infrastructure, with specific mentions of roads, public transport, and utilities. Projections of worsened traffic congestion and pollution, with safety risks highlighted due to car-dependency and poor connectivity of the proposed site.

Planning and Policy Considerations (261 respondents, 58%): Emphasis on strict adherence to national green belt guidelines and transparent evaluation processes. Critique on potentially preemptive development decisions without adequate public consultation or consideration of cumulative effects on ecology, landscape, heritage, and community well-being. Calls for environmentally and socially sustainable development that aligns with local and regional strategies.

Chapter 6: Bath to Bristol corridor (Keynsham, Saltford, Hicks Gate and Whitchurch Village)

Keynsham and Saltford: Area overview

Preservation of green spaces (214 respondents, 82%): Respondents mentioned the importance of protecting the green belt, highlighting the value of open landscapes and the risks to wildlife, community spaces, and rural identity from development.

Housing and development strategy (189 respondents, 72%): Opinions are divided, with some advocating for new housing to meet local needs and others calling for strict development limits to prevent Keynsham and Saltford from becoming overcrowded and losing their character.

Environmental and health implications (140 respondents, 54%): Concerns were raised about the potential environmental damage from new developments, emphasising the importance of green spaces for public health and community resilience.

Traffic and transportation concerns (117 respondents, 45%): Respondents raised issues about increased traffic and congestion due to development, suggesting solutions such as new transport options and infrastructure improvements.

Public engagement and decision-making (62 respondents, 24%): There is a call for more effective community consultation on development plans and for decision-making that reflects local preferences and needs.

Alternative development solutions (46 respondents, 18%): Proposals included adopting different development approaches like garden cities, prioritizing brownfield redevelopment, and housing designs that use land more efficiently.

Infrastructure and services (36 respondents, 14%): The need for better infrastructure to support the population increase was noted, with calls for improvements to public transport, healthcare facilities, and other services.

Economic and social value of development (7 respondents, 3%): A few respondents discussed the economic advantages and social implications of development, weighing the potential benefits against the costs to local communities.

Keynsham and Saltford: Transport Opportunities

Public Transport Reliability and Accessibility (55 respondents, 72%): Emphasis on the need for more reliable and accessible public transport; services and schedules do not always cater to the diverse needs of users, including those with mobility issues or living far from stations.

Traffic Congestion and Environmental Impact (53 respondents, 70%): Concerns about traffic congestion potentially worsening with certain transport plans; strong desire for solutions to improve mobility while protecting air quality.

Infrastructure and Development Impacts (49 respondents, 64%): Tension between enhancing transport links and preserving green spaces; concerns over increased traffic and impact on the environment and local identities.

Active Travel and Green Initiatives (34 respondents, 45%): Mixed views on promoting cycling and walking; discussions on safety and suitability for all, including older individuals or those with disabilities.

Housing Development and Transport Capacity (33 respondents, 43%): Calls for transport plans to manage increased demands from housing developments without causing congestion and preserving community assets.

Financial and Planning Critiques (12 respondents, 16%): Skepticism over transport improvement funding and planning; calls for evidence-based, value-for-money propositions.

Equity and Inclusivity in Transport Planning (1 respondent, 1%): Need for considerate transport planning that is inclusive, avoiding exclusion or penalization of particular groups.

Keynsham and Saltford: Site options

Environmental and Green Belt Consideration (33 respondents, 72%): Mentioned concerns about building on green belt land, noting its importance for wildlife and public wellbeing. Some respondents are open to development if environmental considerations are met.

Infrastructure and Accessibility (32 respondents, 70%): Raised the need for sufficient infrastructure to support new housing, with a focus on traffic, medical facilities, schools, and sewage systems. Public transport improvements and development at sites with existing infrastructure were suggested.

Housing and Local Needs (25 respondents, 54%): Emphasised the need for housing that meets local requirements, such as smaller, affordable homes and social housing. Concerns included potential overpopulation and loss of green spaces.

Community Character and Wellbeing (24 respondents, 52%): Expressed apprehension about developments changing the character of local communities. Preserving open landscapes for mental health and maintaining quality of life in communities were underlined.

Utilisation of Brownfield Sites (12 respondents, 26%): Advocated for the redevelopment of brownfield sites as preferable to greenfield development, and criticised perceived local authority inaction regarding brownfield availability.

Sustainable Development and Transport Solutions (4 respondents, 9%): Discussed the importance of sustainable living and transport, including better public transport, cycling, and walking infrastructure, with attention to environmental impacts and accessibility.

Site: North Keynsham

Traffic and Transport Concerns (102 respondents, 66%): Respondents expressed concerns about increased traffic congestion and strain on Keynsham's infrastructure with the proposed development. Suggestions include improving roads, public transport, and walking/cycling infrastructure.

Green Belt and Open Space Conservation (70 respondents, 45%): Maintaining green belt land and open spaces is highlighted, reflecting worries about lost biodiversity and the blending of distinct local identities. Conversely, some respondents see an opportunity to build sustainable communities on low ecological value land.

Housing Demand and Type (61 respondents, 40%): There is a recognised need for a diverse mix of housing to address shortages and calls for careful planning to reduce the impact on green belts, with some advocating for using the site due to its proximity to transport links.

Flood Risk and Environmental Impact (53 respondents, 34%): Concerns are raised about the site's floodplain status, historical flooding, and climate change. Suggestions encompass careful planning and alternatives less prone to flooding, along with potential for floodplain mitigation strategies.

Ecology and Biodiversity (41 respondents, 27%): The development's potential harm to local wildlife and ecosystems is noted. Respondents call for ecological surveys, enhanced green spaces, and incorporating nature conservation in development, alongside seeing an opportunity for nature recovery.

Alternatives and Strategic Planning (34 respondents, 22%): There is a push for alternative site consideration, such as brownfield land, and strategic land use planning that prioritises long-term environmental, social, and economic sustainability.

Community and Social Infrastructure (33 respondents, 21%): The need for community facilities like schools and healthcare centres alongside housing is emphasised. Concerns are voiced about the delivery of infrastructure commitments from developers.

Infrastructure and Service Pressure (8 respondents, 5%): Some respondents warn that existing infrastructure may not support the increased population. There is a call for improved connectivity, services, and utilities to accommodate growth without compromising the quality of life.

Site: East of Avon Mill Lane

Residential development and community well-being (87 respondents, 66%): Contains views on redeveloping the site into housing; potential benefits include eradication of industrial nuisances and provision of affordable homes, while concerns include strain on local facilities, infrastructure challenges, and increase in noise pollution from the nearby railway.

Brownfield redevelopment and land use policy (48 respondents, 36%): Shows strong favour for developing brownfield sites; this site, due to its past industrial use, is seen as ideal and aligns with the preference to avoid using greenbelt areas, with a focus on densifying urban spaces rather than expanding.

Environmental and health concerns (47 respondents, 36%): Highlights opportunities to improve living conditions by reducing noise, pollution, and HGV traffic, though some are apprehensive about possible traffic increases leading to worse air quality; suggestions include integrating green spaces and sustainable practices in development plans.

Disruption and local infrastructure (42 respondents, 32%): Concerns over the disruption of relocating businesses and pressure on local infrastructure such as schools and healthcare services; but some see benefits in replacing an industrial area with a residential zone that could improve infrastructure if carefully designed.

Traffic and transport infrastructure (40 respondents, 30%): Worry over potential traffic congestion in an area already known for heavy traffic; while proximity to transport links is positive, fear of worsening air quality and noise pollution draws suggestions for traffic control measures and assessing the adequacy of current road access.

Access to amenities and sustainability (38 respondents, 29%): Agreement on the site's suitable central location near amenities conducive to sustainable, car-free living, alongside contrasting opinions on whether the current infrastructure can sustain more residents without significant development of public transport and local services.

Economic impact and employment (17 respondents, 13%): Some criticism for the potential loss of local employment due to business relocation; while a perceived opportunity exists to remove industrial nuisances, the importance of maintaining or enhancing job opportunities in the area leads to suggestions for mixed-use spaces to retain work within the town.

Site: Central Keynsham

Impact on Parking and Accessibility (236 respondents, 87%): Parking seen as essential for local businesses and community facilities like the scout HQ. Development reducing spaces could harm trade and convenience, with calls for maintaining or increasing facilities.

Impact on Local Economy and Community (153 respondents, 56%): Concerns that redevelopment could damage the town's character and economy, possibly leading to business departures. Acknowledgement that thoughtful redevelopment could revitalise Keynsham.

Alternative Development Suggestions (136 respondents, 50%): Proposals for using alternative sites to preserve parking and Keynsham's assets. Emphasis on a strategic, long-term approach that considers infrastructure and public transport improvements.

Safety and Accessibility for Youth and Community Groups (93 respondents, 34%): Importance of parking for groups like scouts highlighted, with calls to preserve facilities to maintain community life and support affordable activities.

Sustainable Transport and Environmental Concerns (59 respondents, 22%): Critique of expectations for a shift to sustainable transport without public transport improvements. Concerns about environmental impact of demolishing and new construction, and loss of green spaces.

Housing Affordability and Infrastructure (31 respondents, 11%): Concerns over the affordability of new housing and additional strain on infrastructure, with scepticism about sustainability of further development without corresponding improvements.

Engagement and Participation in Planning Process (24 respondents, 9%): Disappointment in the lack of consultation with local stakeholders, with a call for inclusive planning processes that incorporate residents' views and needs.

Site: West Keynsham

Infrastructure and Service Capacity (132 respondents, 68%): Concerns about the impact of new developments on Keynsham's existing infrastructure and services, such as roads, public transport, healthcare, and schools, with some seeing potential for improvements.

Green Belt Preservation vs. Development Needs (113 respondents, 59%): Tension between the need for new housing and protecting green belt land, recognising the demand for up to 200 dwellings versus the potential harm to rural character and wildlife habitats.

Traffic and Transport Solutions (70 respondents, 36%): Issues of existing and future traffic congestion, mainly on Charlton Road, and substandard public transport services, with suggestions to improve connectivity and sustainable travel options.

Landscape and Conservation Impact (70 respondents, 36%): Emphasis on safeguarding Keynsham's landscape setting, green spaces, and rural tranquility from development threats, with calls for careful planning to protect visual amenities.

Sustainable and Ecological Development (53 respondents, 27%): Calls for new housing to be sustainable and ecologically considerate, making use of brownfield sites, promoting biodiversity and carbon neutrality, and supporting active travel.

Community Integration and Accessibility (52 respondents, 27%): Criticism of potential housing developments being too isolated from Keynsham centre, stressing the need for accessibility to shops, services, and transport.

Economic and Employment Concerns (42 respondents, 22%): Concerns about the loss of local employment areas to developments and the importance of job opportunities to match housing growth, with suggestions to invest in existing business infrastructure.

Housing Strategy and Community Needs (27 respondents, 14%): Discussion of the need for a housing mix that addresses local demands, including affordable and social housing options, as well as housing that offers broader community benefits.

Public Participation and Policy Compliance (7 respondents, 4%): Desire for transparent decision-making processes respecting policies on green belt land, ensuring development aligns with community needs and environmental objectives.

Flooding and Environmental Risks (5 respondents, 3%): Worry about the potential exacerbation of flooding and water management issues, with a call for innovative planning to mitigate these risks.

Site: South East Keynsham

Infrastructure and Accessibility (174 respondents, 82%): Concerns about inadequate transportation infrastructure, such as road congestion, safety of narrow lanes, and insufficient access routes for new developments; suggestions for using brownfield sites and improving sustainable transport.

Housing Demand and Location (167 respondents, 78%): Mixed opinions on the necessity and suitability of housing development in South East Keynsham due to remoteness and reliance on cars; suggestions include focusing on alternative sites with better infrastructure.

Green Belt and Urban Sprawl (141 respondents, 66%): Strong opposition to building on green belt land, with worries of countryside damage, loss of agricultural land, and towns merging; occasional support for ecologically sensitive development.

Environmental and Ecological Impact (113 respondents, 53%): Potential threats to wildlife, loss of green space, worsening pollution and flooding; some proposal for woodlands for flood mitigation, while others see an opportunity for development to integrate with ecosystems.

Community and Services (96 respondents, 45%): Emphasis on the need for housing to include local amenities and services like schools and GP surgeries; concerns about overburdening resources and eroding community cohesion against potential local growth and housing needs support.

Economic Implications (9 respondents, 4%): Viability of new businesses and impact on local property values discussed, with skepticism about attracting retailers and considerations on the economic landscape.

Transportation Solutions and Suggestions (4 respondents, 2%): Calls for traffic mitigation via new roads, improved public transport, and cycling or pedestrian paths as part of comprehensive transportation planning.

Site: West Saltford

Green Belt and Development Controversy (619 respondents, 89%): Division over preserving countryside against demands for housing; some advocate for green spaces reflecting worries about merging communities and loss of agricultural land, whilst others see development as necessary for housing needs.

Traffic and Infrastructure Challenges (561 respondents, 81%): Anxiety about increased traffic on the A4 due to new housing; criticisms of current road capacity and safety for non-motorized users, with suggestions for improved infrastructure and alternative transport solutions such as re-opening a railway station.

Housing Needs and Sustainability (475 respondents, 69%): Calls for more affordable and sustainable housing; concerns that development scale is unsuitable for rural village, with a preference for smaller, integrated approaches that respect the village identity and character.

Environmental and Ecological Concerns (456 respondents, 66%): Concern around habitat destruction and biodiversity loss; proposals for enhancing green belts and incorporating natural spaces in development to support ecosystems and resident wellbeing.

Cultural and Social Identity (369 respondents, 53%): Concerns that development may erode the rural and cultural identity of Saltford, transforming it into a suburban area; emphasis on maintaining individuality and the social fabric of the community.

Public Participation and Planning Policy (62 respondents, 9%): Dissatisfaction with the planning process; demands for genuine community engagement, adherence to green belt protections, and a planning policy that incorporates impact studies and public opinion.

Impact on Local Services and Community Wellbeing (39 respondents, 6%): Concern about the strain on local services like GP practices and schools; calls for planning that includes essential services and infrastructure to support community wellbeing.

Site: South Saltford

Housing Development and Urban Expansion (805 respondents, 83%): Concerns include loss of agricultural land, impacts on biodiversity and the rural character of South Saltford. Loss of recreational space and wildlife habitats is noted, alongside recognition of the need for more, including affordable, housing.

Traffic, Infrastructure, and Safety Concerns (734 respondents, 76%): Concern over increased traffic, impacts on local roads, and safety, with doubts about the adequacy of current infrastructure to support further development.

Environmental and Ecological Impact (587 respondents, 61%): Potential ecological damage from large-scale development is a concern, with suggestions to consider brownfield development and new green spaces.

Community and Recreational Losses (576 respondents, 59%): Strong opposition to loss of Saltford Golf Club facilities, with emphasis on their social and economic importance and potential job losses.

Alternative Suggestions and Planning Policies (460 respondents, 47%): Proposals of using brownfield sites and developing semi-urban areas, critiques of the plans' alignment with B&NES council policies, and calls for planning to avoid urban sprawl.

Loss of Agricultural Land and Food Security (80 respondents, 8%): Concerns over the loss of prime agricultural land affecting UK's food security and local food produce availability.

Site: Hicks Gate

Transport and Accessibility Considerations (79 respondents, 72%): Proximity to A4 and mass transit potential at Hicks Gate is valued; sustainable travel options like park and ride, cycling, and walking paths are advocated, while concerns over A4 congestion and traffic safety are noted.

Housing Needs and Development Preferences (68 respondents, 62%): The need for affordable housing at Hicks Gate is recognised; preferences are split between higher-density housing or mixed-use development and fears of urban sprawl, greenbelt encroachment, and under-utilisation of brownfield sites.

Socio-Economic Impacts and Community Infrastructure (40 respondents, 36%): Potential for local employment and enhanced community facilities at Hicks Gate is acknowledged; concerns about community character erosion, anti-social behaviour risk, and pressure on services are also raised.

Strategic Planning and Regulatory Compliance (33 respondents, 30%): Adherence to planning policy framework and alignment with local and regional frameworks at Hicks Gate are discussed, with calls for development priorities on brownfield sites and meeting conditions on sustainability and community benefit.

Environmental Sustainability and Green Infrastructure (27 respondents, 25%): Support for carbon-neutral development at Hicks Gate is shown, suggesting renewable energy integration and high building insulation standards; importance is placed on retaining and enhancing green spaces.

Flood Risk and Environmental Protection (20 respondents, 18%): Concerns about flooding risks in areas like Stockwood Lane at Hicks Gate are prominent; emphasis on comprehensive flood mitigation, greenbelt protection, and ecologically considerate development is evident.

Site: Whitchurch village: Area overview

Housing Development and Aesthetic Concerns (411 respondents, 98%): Discussions vary from addressing the housing shortage and the need for affordable options for young people, to concerns about development not matching the village's aesthetic, over-development, and changing the community's character. Preference for development on brownfield sites is noted to protect green spaces.

Green Belt Preservation vs Development Needs (408 respondents, 98%): Opinions are split between preserving the green belt for environmental and heritage reasons and the pressure for housing and economic growth. Some support limited green belt development in exceptional cases whereas others oppose any encroachment on green spaces, fearing urban sprawl and loss of village identity.

Infrastructure and Services Under Strain (407 respondents, 97%): There is concern that local infrastructure and services (GP and dental practices, schools, shops) are inadequate for current residents, exacerbated by poor public transport that disconnects the community. There's a call for improving infrastructure alongside or prior to housing expansion.

Sustainability and Environmental Concerns (17 respondents, 4%): The need for environmentally sustainable development is stressed, with support for repurposing underutilised spaces and maintaining green belts. Importance is placed on development patterns that protect biodiversity and enhance public green spaces for health benefits.

Community Consultation and Inclusion in Planning (12 respondents, 3%): Residents want more meaningful participation in planning, with a transparent process that incorporates community feedback and respects local views and needs.

Economic Impacts and Employment Opportunities (7 respondents, 2%): The conversion of commercial properties to residential use is critiqued for impacting local employment. It's suggested that developments should include mixed-use spaces for shopping, business hubs, and amenities to boost jobs and economic growth.

Transportation and Accessibility Challenges (4 respondents, 1%): Increased housing is seen to potentially strain transportation infrastructure. Criticisms focus on traffic congestion, pedestrian safety, and inadequate public transport, with calls for improvements in sustainable transport and better connectivity.

Site: Whitchurch village: Transport opportunities

Strategic Development and Transport Planning (401 respondents, 97%): Residents call for strategic planning linking transport infrastructure improvements with new developments, including innovative solutions like mobility hubs and park & ride facilities, yet express skepticism about plan execution and alignment with community needs.

Sustainable vs. Car-dependent Living (400 respondents, 96%): There is a push for a sustainable Whitchurch with reduced car dependency via better planning, despite the current reliance on cars due to inadequate public transport.

Traffic Congestion and Air Quality (394 respondents, 95%): Proposals to reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality include rerouting heavy goods vehicles and establishing traffic calming measures, amid concerns that new development could intensify these issues.

Green Belt Preservation vs. Development Needs (394 respondents, 95%): The need to protect the green belt is contrasted with the demand for housing and improved transport; some advocate for using alternative sites to prevent sprawl while others support expansion to enhance connectivity.

Active Travel Infrastructure (393 respondents, 95%): Residents suggest the necessity for safer, integrated pedestrian and cycling routes, also addressing the practicality and safety of these routes in rural settings.

Public Transport Reliability and Coverage (388 respondents, 93%): Calls for more reliable and comprehensive bus services are evident, highlighting a need for improved public transport to reduce reliance on personal vehicles.

Site: Whitchurch village, Option A: Land to the west and east of the A37

Preservation of Green Spaces (461 respondents, 93%): Strong opposition to development on preservation grounds, with the loss of recreational areas, wildlife habitats, and risk of urban sprawl seen as detrimental to community and environmental sustainability.

Alternative Development Solutions (443 respondents, 89%): Preference for housing development on brownfield sites and using existing infrastructure; stresses the need for sustainable planning for Whitchurch Village that considers innovative housing and infrastructure improvements.

Traffic and Transportation Challenges (433 respondents, 87%): Concern over potential traffic congestion increase, particularly on the A37, with suggestions including enhancing public transport, promoting sustainable travel, and upgrading road infrastructure.

Environmental Impact (428 respondents, 86%): Broader environmental implications of development raised, such as biodiversity loss and impact on climate efforts, with calls for prioritising brownfield sites and aligning strategies with environmental protection goals.

Infrastructure and Services Strain (424 respondents, 85%): Existing infrastructure perceived as inadequate for additional housing, with concerns about GP service capacity and schooling facilities' strain; discussions about the need for improved local services to support development.

Community and Heritage Preservation (411 respondents, 83%): Strong value on maintaining Whitchurch Village's identity and character, with development threatening local heritage assets and semi-rural appeal opposed; conservation of heritage-sensitive areas emphasised.

Housing Needs and Affordability (394 respondents, 79%): While recognising the demand for more and affordable housing, there is scepticism about meeting local needs and ensuring new homes' affordability without overwhelming public services.

Site: Whitchurch village, Option B: Eastern extension of the village

Green Belt and Environmental Concerns (432 respondents, 95%): Strong opposition due to potential damage to green belt, loss of wildlife habitats, agricultural land, and impact on landscapes and conservation areas, with calls for sustainable development to avoid urban sprawl.

Housing and Development Needs Versus Preservation (424 respondents, 93%): While there's an understanding of housing needs, there's a preference for preserving green spaces and avoiding overdevelopment, with suggestions for smaller-scale developments or use of less sensitive areas.

Potential Alternatives and Solutions (416 respondents, 91%): Proposals include developing brownfield sites, considering other options beyond just Option B, and focusing on areas with minimal environmental impact, ensuring development aligns with village characteristics and green space preservation.

Infrastructure and Local Services Strain (406 respondents, 89%): Development is seen to strain already pressured infrastructure; improvements to roads, medical services, schools, and public transport are recommended before or alongside development.

Traffic and Transport Issues (403 respondents, 88%): Increased traffic, especially on the A37 and nearby roads, concerns many, highlighting safety issues, potential pollution, and the need for improved traffic management and public transport options.

Community Impact and Cohesion (402 respondents, 88%): There's a worry that Option B could change Whitchurch Village's character, impacting community cohesion; development should strive to maintain rural identity and strengthen the community fabric.

Health, Education, and Local Amenities (392 respondents, 86%): Concerns about the adequacy of health services and schools arise, with a call for improved existing amenities and the introduction of new services in line with population growth.

Landscape and Heritage Conservation (384 respondents, 84%): Emphasises the need to protect the character of the landscape and heritage assets from developmental impacts, with suggestions to maintain green buffers and sympathetic development.

Legal and Policy Compliance (383 respondents, 84%): Some point to contradictions with policies designed to protect the green belt, urging adherence to existing planning frameworks and justifications for any departures.

Community Sentiment and Participation (382 respondents, 84%): Call for more transparency and community consultation to ensure developments reflect local needs and preferences.

Site: Whitchurch village, Option C: Land to the west of the A37 (150 homes)

Environmental and Green Belt Impact (428 respondents, 95%): Respondents are strongly opposed due to potential negative effects on the green belt, local wildlife, and the overall environment. Concerns include habitat damage, pollution increase, and loss of green spaces affecting mental health and community well-being.

Alternative Development Suggestions (420 respondents, 93%): Suggestions are to explore brownfield sites, RAF Charmy Down, or other areas for development, emphasizing strategic, sustainable growth without compromising the environment or village life quality.

Traffic and Road Safety (412 respondents, 91%): The expected rise in traffic could worsen congestion and hazards, particularly on the A37, raising safety concerns for pedestrians and drivers, and potentially affecting the community's health and safety.

Infrastructure and Amenities (399 respondents, 88%): There's concern about the current infrastructure's capacity to handle new developments, with a call for improved transport, healthcare, education, and local services.

Heritage and Historic Land (394 respondents, 87%): Construction on or near heritage-sensitive land prompts protective stances against potential impact on important historical assets, with a desire to maintain the cultural integrity of Whitchurch Village.

Health and Well-being (391 respondents, 87%): Concerns involve the loss of open spaces, escalated pollution, and congestion from the development, stressing the need for more healthcare provision and recreational areas for local people's health.

Education and Schooling (389 respondents, 86%): The ability of local schools to support additional students from the new housing is questioned, calling for significant investment in educational infrastructure.

Community Cohesion and Identity (387 respondents, 86%): There's worry that the village's character may be lost, leading to urban sprawl and a diluted community identity, with insufficient facilities to maintain social cohesion.

Public Consultation and Planning Process (385 respondents, 85%): Calls for more transparency in the consultation process, community engagement, and consideration of residents' views.

Site: Whitchurch village, Option D: Eastern extension of the village (150 homes)

Green Belt and Environmental Concerns (424 respondents, 94%): Impact on green belt central, with split views—some cite potential harm to rural areas and threats to wildlife, while others believe housing demand justifies development with environmental mitigations.

Alternative Development Sites and Options (419 respondents, 93%): Preference voiced for RAF Charmy Down and brownfield sites over green belt; more strategic, less contentious site selection desired.

Housing Needs and Character of Whitchurch Village (412 respondents, 91%): Balancing housing provision with maintaining village identity debated—some support new homes as a response to the housing crisis, others worry about urban sprawl effects.

Infrastructure and Service Capacity (410 respondents, 91%): Existing infrastructure deemed insufficient for additional homes; calls for investment in GP services, schools, and roads to manage increased demands.

Heritage and Landscape Impact (396 respondents, 88%): Concerns highlighted over potential conflicts with the character of the conservation area and landscape harm due to new development.

Safety, Traffic, and Pollution (390 respondents, 86%): Safety and pollution from additional traffic a worry; suggestions include better road infrastructure and promoting active travel.

Social Infrastructure and Community Services (382 respondents, 85%): Noted deficit in community services to support development; importance stressed on integrating necessary facilities for sustainable community growth.

Community Sentiment and Participation (381 respondent, 84%): Discrepancy observed between council proposals and community preferences; community engagement and transparent decision-making called for.

Whitchurch village: Comparing Site Options

Housing need and development impacts (432 respondents, 94%): Concerns over balancing the demand for affordable housing against issues like pollution and service strain with suggestions for focused, sustainable growth.

Infrastructure and local services (422 respondents, 92%): Emphasised need for improvement in infrastructure like traffic, healthcare, and educational facilities to support the village's population.

Green belt and environmental conservation (418 respondents, 91%): Strong opposition to housing on green belt land due to risks of urban sprawl and biodiversity loss, with some advocating for strategic, nature-friendly planning.

Community and heritage preservation (416 respondents, 90%): Desire to preserve Whitchurch Village's distinct identity and character, avoiding merging with nearby areas and maintaining historical sites.

Public opinion and community engagement (410 respondents, 89%): Noted resistance to housing development, particularly on green belt land, and a call for genuinely considering community feedback in decisions.

Sustainability and transportation (392 respondents, 85%): Importance of eco-friendly development, public transport improvements, and promotion of active travel for healthier lifestyles.

Education and recreational facilities (384 respondents, 83%): Highlighted the shortfall in planning for educational and recreational facilities to meet the needs of an expanded population.

Chapter 7: Somer Valley: Vision, Strategy and Options

Somer Valley overview

Sustainable Transport and Infrastructure Challenges (36 respondents, 72%): High car dependency noted with suggestions for better public transport, cycle paths, and walking routes. Issues of congestion and inadequate bus services contrast with ideas for rail connectivity and eco-friendly options like electric buses.

Housing and Community Needs (32 respondents, 64%): Varied housing needs, especially for older populations, raised with emphasis on brownfield site development and affordable options. Concerns about housing mix and density possibly altering community character and putting a strain on infrastructure.

Environmental and Landscape Considerations (16 respondents, 32%): Impact on landscapes, biodiversity, and ecological networks from development discussed. Flood risks, air pollution, and climate change highlighted, alongside calls for green space protection and environmental agency involvement.

Access to Healthcare and Education (14 respondents, 28%): Insufficient healthcare facilities and challenges accessing secondary schools noted. The need for concurrent expansion of healthcare and educational infrastructure with housing development stressed.

Strategic Planning and Governance (11 respondents, 22%): Criticism of inadequate local resident consultation and transparency in planning processes.

Community Well-being and Social Cohesion (10 respondents, 20%): Worries about villages becoming dormitory towns and loss of social cohesion. Development plans encouraged to support community well-being, youth facilities, and initiatives for integrating new residents.

Local Economy and Employment Opportunities (9 respondents, 18%): Importance of local employment and business development in economic revitalisation identified. Comments on unsuccessful enterprise zones, with suggestions for supporting existing businesses and attracting new opportunities.

Somer Valley opportunities

Infrastructure and Services Capacity (25 respondents, 81%): Concerns about current infrastructure and services being insufficient for a growing population, potentially leading to congestion and overstretched schools and healthcare.

Economic Opportunities vs Community Well-being (19 respondents, 61%): Recognition of economic benefits from development, but with worries about the impact on traffic, pollution, community dynamics, and local services.

Housing Development and Location (18 respondents, 58%): Discussions on the need for new housing to be sustainable, appropriately located, and in harmony with local character and community needs.

Active Travel and Public Transport (12 respondents, 39%): Calls for improvements in active travel options and public transport to reduce congestion and promote a healthier lifestyle, despite challenges posed by the area's topography and existing infrastructure.

Environmental and Green Space Preservation (10 respondents, 32%): Strong sentiment towards protecting green spaces and wildlife, with a preference for redeveloping brownfield rather than greenfield sites and minimising flood risks.

Community Facilities and Recreation (6 respondents, 19%): Desire for new developments to include affordable and accessible recreational amenities to enhance community life.

Flood Risk and Environmental Sustainability (2 respondents, 6%): Specific concerns about building in flood-prone areas, exacerbating flooding, and the broader environmental impacts of development, stressing the importance of sustainable practices.

Sites overview: Somer Valley

Housing Development and Land Use (9 respondents, 90%): Discussions reflect diverse opinions on housing development, prioritising brownfield sites over agricultural land to preserve green spaces. Sustainability concerns are raised, particularly with the car dependency in Farrington Gurney, and tensions are noted between growth and preserving the environment.

Sustainable Development and Transport Infrastructure (7 respondents, 70%): Respondents highlight the lack of sustainable transport options and the high car dependency in Somer Valley. Calls for investment in improved connectivity and concerns about the adequacy of transport proposals to meet future needs and environmental impact.

Community Cohesion and Local Services (6 respondents, 60%): The impact of development on community cohesion and local services is noted, with the need for better infrastructure such as schools and healthcare. There are concerns about infrastructure keeping pace with housing development.

Planning Process and Community Engagement (5 respondents, 50%): There is a desire for a more inclusive planning process that reflects the unique characteristics of Somer Valley, with concerns over transparency and community involvement in decisions. Suggestions for a community-engaged approach to planning are common.

Environmental Sustainability and Agricultural Land (2 respondents, 20%): The use of agricultural land for development, especially in the Farrington Gurney area, raises issues about classification, sustainability, and car dependence. There is advocacy for prioritising brownfield sites for development to protect the environment and agricultural lands.

Economic Development and Employment Opportunities (2 respondents, 20%): There is a perceived need for more local employment opportunities to decrease commuting out of the valley. Critiques of the enterprise zone's narrow focus and calls for a broader economic development approach supporting diverse sectors and local business are present.

Site: Peasedown

Infrastructure and Local Services Expansion (94 respondents, 82%): Adequacy of existing infrastructure to support housing developments questioned, with a call for improved local services and infrastructure expansions.

Housing Needs and Community Cohesion (72 respondents, 63%): Need for more affordable housing acknowledged, while maintaining community resources and village character is a concern.

Environmental and Biodiversity Considerations (65 respondents, 57%): Potential impact on local environment and biodiversity from developments worries residents; importance of preserving green spaces is highlighted.

Preservation of Rural Identity vs. Economic Growth (40 respondents, 35%): Balance sought between maintaining Peasedown's rural charm and seizing economic development opportunities.

Traffic and Transportation Safety (32 respondents, 28%): Expansion fears include worsening traffic congestion and road safety risks.

Access to Green Energy and Sustainable Development (10 respondents, 9%): Sustainable living practices and integration of green energy within scenic landscapes are discussed..

Archaeological and Cultural Heritage (4 respondents, 4%): Development's impact on the area's archaeological heritage is a point of concern; calls for preservation amidst growth.

Site: North Radstock

Infrastructure and Traffic Management Challenges (55 respondents, 80%): Frustrations over existing road network issues, A367 congestion, inadequate public transport, and risks from additional vehicular access; some suggest mitigation strategies like traffic calming, new roundabouts, and enhanced public transport links.

Community Facilities and Local Amenities (33 respondents, 48%): Concerns about insufficiency of schools, GP services, and retail to support current and future populations; suggestions include enhancing local infrastructure to foster a self-sustaining community.

Environmental and Landscape Preservation (29 respondents, 42%): Strong opposition to loss of green spaces, potential harm to wildlife, increased air pollution, and drainage issues leading to flooding; opportunities for integrating green infrastructure highlighted.

Access to Green Spaces and Recreational Areas (20 respondents, 29%): Concern about loss of accessible green spaces and safe footpaths; potential for redevelopment to improve access to recreational areas through careful planning.

Housing Affordability and Diversity (12 respondents, 17%): Need for affordable housing options for young families and community living; suggestions for diversity including council housing, shared communal areas, and environmentally friendly housing designs.

Cultural and Historical Preservation (6 respondents, 9%): Impact on landscape character and archaeological sites concerns; development seen as a challenge to cultural assets with potential for sensitive incorporation of heritage preservation.

Sustainable Transport and Active Travel Initiatives (4 respondents, 6%): Lack of safe cycling and walking routes; calls for development promoting sustainable transport, with mixed opinions on the potential to reduce car dependency.

Public Consultation and Engagement (2 respondents, 3%): Frustration with the consultation process, feeling that community input is overlooked; room for improvement in engaging residents in planning and decision-making.

Site: East Radstock

Transport and Connectivity (61 respondents, 80%): Concerns about development impact on local transport; calls for improvements in sustainable options and better connectivity amidst traffic congestion worries and the limited public transport available.

Infrastructure and Public Services (49 respondents, 64%): Anxiety over whether the current stretched services, including healthcare and education, could support population increase; points out the need for significant investment in infrastructure.

Housing and Community Impact (44 respondents, 58%): Opposition to large developments that may harm the local community fabric; emphasis on the need for thoughtful, integrated planning that maintains the community's social and economic landscape.

Alternatives and Strategic Planning (42 respondents, 55%): Suggestions for a broader strategic planning conversation that incorporates alternatives to greenfield development, considering brownfield sites or locations near employment hubs to mitigate ecological and infrastructure concerns.

Ecological and Agricultural Concerns (27 respondents, 36%): Highlighting the critical balance between agricultural productivity, ecological integrity, and development pressures; stressing the risks to farm land, habitats, and biodiversity, necessitating careful planning to mitigate environmental impacts.

Active and Sustainable Transport (13 respondents, 17%): Noting the lack of infrastructure for safe, sustainable transport modes; identifying challenges in promoting active travel due to steep topography and insufficient cycling lanes and pedestrian routes.

Social and Recreational Amenities (11 respondents, 14%): Concerns about the potential loss of community resources and recreational spaces due to development; underlining the importance of social infrastructure in new developments for residents' well-being and quality of life.

Economic and Employment Opportunities (1 respondent, 1%): Concern that development may not address insufficient local employment opportunities, potentially leading to increased out-commuting and social and economic disparities.

Flooding and Water Management (1 respondent, 1%): Points to flooding and effective water management issues intensified by development; stressing the need for robust drainage and water management strategies to protect human and natural environments.

West of the Somer Valley Enterprise Zone

Sustainable Energy Solutions and Location Concerns (8 respondents, 73%): Respondents suggest prioritising solar installations on commercial and industrial building rooftops, avoiding Grade 1 agricultural land to protect farming and food security.

Agricultural Land Use vs. Renewable Energy Priorities (7 respondents, 64%): Users stress the importance of preserving prime farmland, advocating for alternative energy project sites such as underutilised urban areas or brownfield sites.

Community Responses and Planning Process Critiques (5 respondents, 45%): Feedback includes demands for comprehensive environmental assessments, improved public consultation, and a transparent approach to evaluating development alternatives.

Renewable Energy Infrastructure Adaptation (3 respondents, 27%): Suggestions involve mandating rooftop solar for businesses in the enterprise zone and adopting successful models from other cities.

Transportation and Infrastructure Challenges (3 respondents, 27%): Concerns about potential traffic, inadequate sustainable transport options, and infrastructure planning are prominent, with calls for better connectivity and transit facilities.

Impact on Local Ecology and Landscape (1 respondent, 9%): The need for careful assessment of impacts on Mendip Hills, local wildlife, and landscape, alongside proposals for improving habitat connectivity and buffer zones.

Site: Farrington Gurney

Rural Character and Community Cohesion (194 respondents, 77%): Development seen as potentially over-urbanising the village, risking rural character..

Planning and Policy Alignment (184 respondents, 73%): Perceived contradictions with development and planning policies designed to protect rural environments; calls for sustainable development aligning with existing infrastructure.

Transport and Traffic Implications (161 respondents, 64%): Concerns about increased traffic and declining air quality; while proposed solutions like traffic calming measures exist, doubts remain about car dependency reduction.

Access to Services and Facilities (119 respondents, 47%): Strain on healthcare and lack of amenities noted; evenly distributed development within the district as a whole and improved services are proposed as alleviating measures.

Impact on Local Amenities and Infrastructure (116 respondents, 46%): Worry over capacity of schools and healthcare to support more residents; incremental development and planned infrastructure upgrade suggested.

Agricultural Land and Biodiversity Loss (99 respondents, 39%): Opposition to building on grade 1 agricultural land citing irreversibility and food security; focus on brownfield sites or less valuable land proposed.

Environmental and Health Concerns (40 respondents, 16%): Increased pollution and green space loss are major worries; opportunities for protective measures and eco-friendly development practices discussed.

Heritage and Landscape Impact (18 respondents, 7%): Anxiety about effects on historical assets and countryside appearance; mitigation through considerate design and development scaling highlighted.

Economic and Employment Considerations (12 respondents, 5%): Potential harm to local businesses from agricultural land loss.

Somer Valley non-strategic sites

Housing Options and Types (12 respondents, 71%): Respondents discussed the need for diverse housing, including small and large site options, with a focus on delivering affordable and smaller houses suitable for rural communities.

Development Location and Land Use (12 respondents, 71%): Debate centred on prioritising brownfield and infill sites close to town centres to make use of existing infrastructure and reduce greenfield land use.

Community Needs and Integration (8 respondents, 47%): Concern for development to address local needs, including affordability, integration with current services, and maintaining the social fabric.

Strategic Planning and Assessment (8 respondents, 47%): Some exhibited mistrust in the strategic site appraisal process and called for detailed impact assessments.

Impact on Infrastructure and Services (4 respondents, 24%): Concerns were raised about the sufficiency of current infrastructure and the need for planning that accommodates development.

Sustainability and Environmental Concerns (3 respondents, 18%): Unease expressed about the environmental impact on air quality, traffic, and proximity to sensitive locations.

Economic Implications and Developer Contributions (3 respondents, 18%): Discussions included the economic risks of developments and the potential for infrastructure costs to limit affordable housing contributions.

Site: WF01

Accessibility and Site Location Concerns (2 respondents, 50%): Accessibility issues noted, with Site WF01's location separated from town by an industrial estate, leading to discussions on the importance of integrating new developments with existing urban infrastructure.

Planning and Developmental Constraints (2 respondents, 50%): Concerns regarding the opportunities of Site WF01's development are contingent on addressing flooding, accessibility, and integration with current urban areas, with planning as a potential solution.

Housing and Community Facilities (1 respondent, 25%): Acknowledgement of Site WF01's potential to meet housing needs and provide community facilities, emphasising thoughtful execution as key to community welfare enhancement.

Traffic Management and Air Quality (1 respondent, 25%): Concerns over potential traffic increase and air quality deterioration from Site WF01's development, highlighting the need for effective traffic management and environmental impact assessments.

Site: MSN28a and b

Community and Social Wellbeing (4 respondents, 67%): Seen as a logical extension to Midsomer Norton's southwestern boundary, the development is anticipated to provide public open spaces for recreation and socialisation, along with improved local connections. However, the site's distance from key amenities led to concerns about community identity and accessibility.

Housing and Local Infrastructure (4 respondents, 67%): Addressing local housing shortages with affordable homes, the site's development is associated with expected infrastructure enhancements via s106 and CIL payments. However, concerns include potential traffic increase and overdevelopment due to its remote location from town centres.

Environmental Considerations and Green Space Provision (4 respondents, 67%): The development is noted for its likely positive environmental outcomes, including green infrastructure and over 10% net biodiversity gain. The integration of public open spaces is highlighted, along with concerns over air quality degradation and the necessity for accessible, eco-friendly transport options.

Planning and Development Strategy (3 respondents, 50%): The site's development is seen as a potential solution for housing needs in B&NES and the wider region. Calls for more transparent and participatory planning, with a strategic focus on leveraging economic, social, and environmental benefits without impacting the green belt, were also noted.

Economic and Employment Opportunities (1 respondent, 17%): Expected to stimulate the local economy through job creation, increased local business demand, and potentially higher council tax revenues, the project also raises concerns about balancing economic growth with environmental preservation and community wellbeing.

Site: RAD 31c

Strategic planning and land use (4 respondents, 80%): Respondents support a strategic approach to land use at RAD 31c, advocating for housing expansion outside of the green belt through sensible infill without expanding village boundaries unnecessarily; early-phase development faces few constraints and aligns with strategic objectives.

Housing development support and viability (3 respondents, 60%): Stakeholders like Bromford Housing and the Silverwood Partnership express interest in residential development on RAD 31c, highlighting its potential for housing and emphasizing the site's availability, suitability, and deliverability.

Conservation balance (2 respondents, 40%): The balance between residential development and the site's geological conservation is essential to secure support for development projects, aiming for harmonious integration of development and conservation objectives.

Community and stakeholder engagement (2 respondents, 40%): Engagement with stakeholders, including local authorities and potential developers, is prioritized to ensure a collaborative and transparent planning process.

Environmental and heritage protection (1 respondent, 20%): Recognizing RAD 31c's geological rather than ecological significance, planning processes consider environmental and historic impacts, with no significant concerns from Natural England or the council's archaeologist.

Site: MSN23 and PAU24a

Development approach and place-specific planning (5 respondents, 100%): Users discuss various approaches to development, advocating for cautious, gradual progress to integrate growth with existing infrastructure and services. Emphasis is placed on strategic planning unique to each site.

Economic vs environmental priorities (2 respondents, 40%): Balancing economic development with environmental conservation is a key concern among users. Discussions focus on non-green belt development while being mindful of traffic implications and sustainability.

Infrastructure and traffic impact (1 respondent, 20%): Concerns are centred around development strain on local infrastructure, with a focus on the potential for increased traffic and its impact on existing roads. Calls for traffic assessments and infrastructure planning are evident.

Sustainability and urban density (1 respondent, 20%): Infilling is suggested as a preferred sustainable development method, aimed at reducing urban sprawl and concentrating resources where most needed. This theme addresses the balance between densification and quality of living.

Land ownership and development strategy (1 respondent, 20%): Users express divergent views on development involving multiple landowners. Coordination and a unified approach are favoured by some, while others highlight the need for balanced decision-making to avoid bias.

Site: PAU11 and 12

Housing and Population Growth Debate (7 respondents, 88%): Divided opinions on housing necessity and scale; some cite current growth as unsustainable, others propose small-scale or brownfield development; concerns about overpopulation and desires for community-beneficial growth reflected.

Infrastructure and Traffic Concerns (4 respondents, 50%): Adequacy of local infrastructure questioned, with focus on narrow and flood-prone Farrington Road; safety concerns due to visibility issues; some believe small developments manageable with infrastructure improvements.

Sustainable Development and Brownfield Focus (3 respondents, 38%): Preference for sustainable practices and brownfield site prioritization to preserve agricultural land and green spaces; recognition of the finite nature of local environments.

Community Integration and Development Strategy (3 respondents, 38%): Concerns about new developments lacking integration with village center; suggestions for holistic planning and development of new towns near transport links for sustainable growth.

Developer Contributions and Local Benefits (1 respondent, 12%): Dissatisfaction with perceived inadequate developer contributions to local enhancements; desire for developments with clear, direct, and immediate community benefits.

Environmental and Wildlife Considerations (1 respondent, 12%): Highlighting potential negative impacts of development on wildlife and landscape; loss of green fields and clean air of concern, underscoring sustainable planning needs.

Chapter 8: Rural Areas: Vision, Strategy and Options

Rural areas overview

Land Use and Development Strategy (47 respondents, 82%): Strategic land use planning in rural areas should consider the unique needs, including brownfield sites use, green belt preservation, and avoiding disproportionate development, with sustainability and local character in mind.

Community-led Planning and Local Involvement (35 respondents, 61%): Emphasises the importance of community involvement in planning to ensure developments meet rural communities' specific needs and maintain their unique character.

Transportation and Public Services Capacity (27 respondents, 47%): Identifies the strain on transport and public services due to rural development, stressing the importance of enhancing capacity and accessibility to manage growth.

Housing Needs and Affordability (27 respondents, 47%): Highlights the need for affordable, accessible homes and diverse housing types in rural areas to serve different demographic groups and maintain local character.

Transport Infrastructure and Accessibility (19 respondents, 33%): Points to the need for improved transport infrastructure to support rural communities, reduce car dependency, and promote greener transport options like electric vehicles.

Sustainable Development and Environmental Protection (17 respondents, 30%): Advocates for environmentally sustainable development in rural areas that protects natural resources and promotes biodiversity alongside accommodating growth.

Economic and Social Sustainability (12 respondents, 21%): Addresses the need for development that not only provides housing but also supports local employment and social infrastructure for cohesive rural communities.

Infrastructure and Services Upgrading (6 respondents, 11%): Underlines the urgency to upgrade and expand essential services and infrastructure in rural areas, including healthcare, education, and utilities, to meet current needs and future growth.

Rural areas: Village site options

Planning and Development Process (33 respondents, 66%): Criteria and processes for site selection are scrutinized, with calls for more comprehensive, evidence-based approaches that consider a broader scope of factors affecting sustainability and viability of village development.

Sustainability and Environmental Impact (31 respondents, 62%): Balance between development and environmental conservation is emphasised; discussions stress the importance of factoring in biodiversity, green spaces, and environmental risks—like flooding and air quality—into development plans.

Infrastructure and Amenities (28 respondents, 56%): Respondents underscore the need for developments to be paired with improved infrastructure, such as transportation, healthcare, and education, to avoid overburdening existing facilities and support community well-being.

Transport and Connectivity (25 respondents, 50%): Concerns focus on how new development will affect traffic and transportation infrastructure, with a strong call for enhanced public transport and sustainable travel options to meet local needs and reduce reliance on cars.

Housing Affordability and Diversity (18 respondents, 36%): There are significant discussions about the lack of affordable and diverse housing, spotlighting the needs for smaller homes and different tenures to cater to a spectrum of local residents, including the young and elderly.

Impact on Rural Character and Heritage (7 respondents, 14%): The effect of development on the distinctive character and historical heritage of rural villages is worrying some, who advocate for development that is mindful of village aesthetics and history.

Regional Growth Strategy Misalignment (5 respondents, 10%): The alignment between sustainable village development and regional growth strategies is questioned, indicating a call for planning decisions to be coherent with broader objectives and community sustainability.

Community-led vs Top-down Development (2 respondents, 4%): There is a preference for developments that are community-led and tailored to the unique needs and characteristics of villages, instead of generic, imposed strategies.

Chapter 9: Development management policy options

Housing Policy H/AH: Affordable housing (large sites)

Policy implementation and delivery methods (29 respondents, 85%): Diverse opinions on delivering affordable housing; debate around on-site provision versus off-site contributions or council initiatives; calls for clear guidelines, including tenure splits, and ensuring policies secure long-term affordable housing.

Strategic planning and local needs (25 respondents, 74%): Emphasis on aligning policies with local needs and strategic planning; importance of using up-to-date local housing needs assessments; calls for policy clarity and provisions for specific groups such as NHS staff.

Viability and flexibility in affordable housing provision (20 respondents, 59%): Consensus on requiring adaptable policies responsive to the economic conditions of projects; suggestions for viability assessments to determine feasible levels of affordable housing while avoiding prohibitive policy rigidity.

Inclusive and diverse communities (13 respondents, 38%): Belief in the social value of affordable housing for achieving social cohesion and diversity; concerns about new developments affecting the character of villages; desire for policies that accommodate local demographic and economic conditions.

Challenges and costs to developers (7 respondents, 21%): Concerns over the financial burdens on developers imposed by regulations and standards, including exploration of a balanced approach between compliance and the viability of delivering affordable housing.

Access to affordable housing for key workers and vulnerable populations (4 respondents, 12%): Acknowledgment of the special need for affordable housing among key workers like NHS staff; urge for explicit policy design catering to these essential service providers and recognition of affordable housing as foundational for social stability.

Policy H/AH: Affordable housing (first homes)

Policy clarity and government approaches (7 respondents, 54%): Calls for council to explain how first homes policies relate to affordable housing, aiming to align local strategies with national guidelines while addressing local affordability issues without complexity or overreliance on short-term funding.

Support for essential and local workers (6 respondents, 46%): Importance of supporting essential workers and local residents, with suggestions for housing protections based on residence or local commitments, including salary thresholds and extending key worker status to sectors like agriculture.

Affordability and accessibility (6 respondents, 46%): Concerns over the affordability of first homes, with suggestions for more accessible ownership models like shared ownership to help local families and essential workers afford homes against the backdrop of potentially inadequate policy.

Impact on traditional affordable housing delivery (6 respondents, 46%): Worries that the first homes initiative may adversely affect traditional affordable housing, questioning its relative effectiveness and reliance on uncertain short-term funding.

Policy implementation and viability (3 respondents, 23%): Calls for robust viability assessments from councils and considering higher minimum discounts for first homes, highlighting the risk of added policy complexity.

Rural worker housing needs and definitions (2 respondents, 15%): Focus on the unique housing requirements of rural workers, recommending the expansion of essential worker definitions to include those in rural economies, balancing their needs against the risk of displacing local families.

Policy H/AH: Affordable housing (small sites)

Viability and Affordability Challenges (12 respondents, 80%): Concerns highlighted about site viability and housing affordability, emphasising the need for affordable homes accessible to essential workers and addressing issues like overcrowding.

Flexibility and Site-Specific Adjustments (6 respondents, 40%): A call for policy flexibility accounting for unique challenges of small sites, ensuring both practical developments and community needs are met.

Social Housing and Rural Development (5 respondents, 33%): Advocacy for stronger approaches to rural social housing development, with suggested compulsory contributions from larger developments to local affordable housing.

Local Needs and Landscape Preservation (5 respondents, 33%): Importance placed on developments meeting local needs and preserving landscapes, balancing housing support for local economies with environmental care.

Off-site Contributions vs. On-site Developments (3 respondents, 20%): A split opinion on affordable housing delivery methods, weighing the integration benefits of on-site development against the broader potential of financial contributions.

Policy Clarity and Implementation Concerns (3 respondents, 20%): Requests for clearer policy articulation and implementation, highlighting concerns of potential loopholes for developers to provide affordable housing.

Financial Levies and Developer Contributions (2 respondents, 13%): Suggestions for imposing levies on high-value developments to finance affordable housing initiatives, leveraging private sector capabilities for social benefit.

Policy H/AH: Affordable housing (viability)

Review Mechanisms and Viability Assessments (13 respondents, 93%): Viability review mechanisms within affordable housing policies are seen as essential, yet they raise concerns about project delays and increased demands on planning department resources.

Policy Flexibility and Site Specificity (7 respondents, 50%): Respondents called for policy flexibility to account for the unique challenges of individual sites, suggesting a one-size-fits-all approach may hinder affordable housing delivery.

Funding and Resource Allocation for Viability Reviews (5 respondents, 36%): There is a dialogue on how to resource and fund the necessary viability assessments while managing the strain on planning departments' budgets.

Impact on Rural Areas and Land Prices (3 respondents, 21%): The conversation includes the impact of affordable housing policy on rural land prices, with some advocating for policies to counteract inflated land price expectations.

Investment Safety and Market Attractiveness (2 respondents, 14%): Late-stage viability reviews are cited as detrimental to investor confidence and market attractiveness, with a suggestion for policy balance between affordable housing needs and investment stability.

Emerging Statutory Requirements and Strategic Planning (2 respondents, 14%): Concerns are raised about affordable housing policies keeping pace with new statutory requirements, stressing the importance of dynamic policies that align with strategic community objectives.

Policy H/RS: Affordable housing regeneration schemes

Policy Flexibility vs. Developer Exploitation (6 respondents, 86%): Respondents focused on the need for a balance between policy flexibility to ensure viability of housing schemes, emphasising a scepticism towards vague language like 'viability concerns' that might be used to avoid obligations.

Uncertainty in Policy and its Effects on Regeneration Areas (4 respondents, 57%): Discussions stressed the need for clearer policy wording, pointing out that current ambiguities, especially concerning 'viability', deter investment and support for regeneration schemes.

Affordable Housing Supply and Tenure Diversity (3 respondents, 43%): Responses suggest the policy fails to address the shortage of affordable housing and does not reflect national framework requirements on housing diversity, advocating for specific housing types and greater density.

Regeneration Viability and Local Economy Impact (2 respondents, 29%): This theme explores the concerns about policy strictness potentially hindering financially feasible redevelopments, which are vital for local housing and infrastructure improvements.

Environmental and Community Upgrades (1 respondent, 14%): Recognising that regeneration should improve not just housing supply but also local infrastructure and environmental efficiency, with a call for upgrading existing housing stocks and communal spaces.

Strategic Policy Alignment and Housing Targets (1 respondent, 14%): Concerns are raised about the policy's consistency with broader strategic housing delivery goals and local housing needs, with suggestions to specify clear targets and increase housing numbers.

Stakeholder Engagement and Tenant Rights (1 respondent, 14%): The importance of resident participation in regeneration projects and the protection of tenant rights is highlighted, with an emphasis on policies that enforce comprehensive engagement strategies.

Policy H/RES: Location of rural exception sites

Policy Alignment and Flexibility (8 respondents, 67%): Division in respondent opinions on whether Policy H/RES should strictly adhere to national policies or be revised for local specificity, with some valuing simplicity and others advocating for revisions to enhance clarity and effectiveness.

Affordable Housing and Local Needs (6 respondents, 50%): Respondents voice concerns about the council's understanding of local affordable housing needs and suggest a strategy not overly reliant on exception site housing, emphasising the need for more responsive measures.

Geographical Coverage and Settlement Size Considerations (4 respondents, 33%): Differing views on limiting rural exception sites to certain settlements, with some disagreements over national policy coherence and calls for village size proportionality in dwelling numbers.

Planning Certainty and Sustainable Development (2 respondents, 17%): Desire for more planning certainty and sustainable development with suggestions for early site allocation, balancing policy flexibility and appropriate rural development.

Market Housing Inclusion (1 respondent, 8%): Debate over market housing funding rural exception sites, with criticism that this undermines the developments' focus on affordable rural housing.

Policy H/RES: Scale of rural exception developments

Impact on local communities and character (7 respondents, 70%): Concerns about larger developments changing village character and impacting infrastructure.

Village size proportionality and housing density (7 respondents, 70%): Discussion on the suitability of a fixed maximum dwelling cap for all villages, potentially unsuitable for smaller communities.

Affordable housing delivery (7 respondents, 70%): Balancing the need for affordable housing with the preservation of the rural village integrity.

Policy requirements and flexibility (5 respondents, 50%): Critique of procedural requirements hindering swift affordable housing delivery and a call for adaptable policies.

National policy alignment and local decision making (2 respondents, 20%): Complexities in aligning local planning with broader national policies.

Research and evidence-based decision making (2 respondents, 20%): Advocacy for informed decisions supported by data to tailor policies to rural area characteristics.

Policy H/RES: Cross-subsidy between market and affordable housing

Clarity and Certainty in Policy (8 respondents, 80%): Respondents favour detailed policy guidance to ensure transparency in funding affordable units through market housing, which assists developers and advocates but caution against too prescriptive an approach, which can hinder flexibility, particularly for smaller rural sites.

Impact on Viability and Development Delivery (5 respondents, 50%): Some respondents are concerned that rigorous cross-subsidy requirements might jeopardise the feasibility of housing projects due to increased construction costs and demands for higher energy performance.

Setting Upper Limits for Market Housing (5 respondents, 50%): Discussions around the appropriate balance between funding for affordable housing through limits on market housing and maintaining project financial viability.

Rural Housing Needs and Site Specifics (3 respondents, 30%): Challenges of generating substantial cross-subsidy in rural areas are noted, with a call for policy adjustments that better address rural housing needs rather than sole reliance on exception sites.

Diverse Housing Stock and Community Reflection (1 respondent, 10%): A desire for housing to reflect community diversity and character through cross-subsidy policy, whilst managing the risk of developments not aligning with local needs or identities.

Sustainability vs. Affordability Trade-offs (1 respondent, 10%): The tension between achieving higher sustainability standards and the affordability of developments is highlighted, underlining the need for balance.

Policy H/RES: First homes rural exception sites

Policy flexibility and constraints (5 respondents, 100%): Respondents mentioned concerns over the policy being too restrictive, potentially limiting rural affordable housing. A balance between national guidance and local criteria-based approaches was suggested for better adaptability.

Criteria-based approaches vs national guidance (4 respondents, 80%): Some raised the need for localised criteria specifically tailored to the unique needs of rural communities, as opposed to broad national policies.

Affordable housing adequacy (2 respondents, 40%): The conversation included opinions that national policies might consider the needs of first-time homeowners but called for a policy to ensure a diverse mix of house types in rural developments.

Geographical coverage and equity (1 respondent, 20%): There was a perception of unequal treatment across different rural areas, with a need for equitable policy application to encourage unbiased housing development.

Policy CLH: Community-led housing for rural exception sites

Criteria-based policy approach (5 respondents, 56%): Divided opinions on whether a criteria-based approach to site selection offers clarity or if it stifles innovation and makes suitable site identification more difficult.

Policy effectiveness and value (4 respondents, 44%): Varying views on the current policy framework, ranging from redundant and valueless to fit for purpose without need for change.

Local autonomy vs national guidelines (4 respondents, 44%): Tension between the desire for more local decision-making in community-led housing and the necessity for national policy adherence, with a need to balance local flexibility and national consistency.

Housing diversity and accessibility (3 respondents, 33%): Calls for policies that promote diverse and accessible housing options to meet the broad needs of rural communities, including affordability.

Impact on sensitive landscapes (1 respondent, 11%): Acknowledgement of the complex issue of developing housing in sensitive areas, emphasising the balance between new housing needs and the preservation of natural and historic environments.

Community engagement and support (1 respondent, 11%): Preference for prioritising sites with proven community support, suggesting policies should foster significant community engagement from the start.

Policy H/EC: Affordable housing requirements within older person and specialist housing (including Extra Care)

Demand for age-specific facilities (5 respondents, 100%): Increasing need for housing tailored to older individuals, with an emphasis on adapting policies to incorporate diversified housing models that include care services, fostering environments that support aging in place.

Local community needs vs. development feasibility (4 respondents, 80%): Balance sought between meeting local community needs for affordable older person housing and the economic implications for developers.

Viability and operational challenges (3 respondents, 60%): Concerns raised about financial sustainability and operational practicality of mandatory affordable housing in specialist and older person's accommodations, alongside recognition of the broader demographic needs within aging communities.

Policy and regulatory framework (3 respondents, 60%): Calls for a nuanced policy approach, with an emphasis on viability assessments specific to older persons and specialist housing as per national policy guidelines, aiming for realistic policies that encourage development without undue burdens.

Community integration and downsizing (2 respondents, 40%): Support for policies that enable older individuals to remain integrated within their communities and promote downsizing to benefit the larger housing ecosystem, aiding in the release of larger family homes to the market.

Policy H/SH: Design for specialist housing and homes for older people

Planning and policy considerations (6 respondents, 75%): Need for well-designed planning and policy to meet older people's housing needs, with concern that overly prescriptive regulations may deter developers or lead to outdated standards.

Accessibility and viability of specialist housing (5 respondents, 62%): Importance of physical and financial access to specialist housing for older adults, with a need for financial viability for developers and a demand for innovative housing models.

Integration and community cohesion (4 respondents, 50%): Emphasizes integrating specialist housing within communities to avoid isolation and maintain support networks, while acknowledging challenges in rural areas.

Health, well-being, and independence (3 respondents, 38%): Highlights how specialist housing can aid health, well-being, and promote independence, with consideration given to reducing strain on health and social services and the necessity of appropriate design and location.

Environmental impact and resource efficiency (1 respondent, 12%): Discusses potential of specialist housing to contribute to environmental sustainability through efficient use of land and resources, balanced with the need for flexibility to accommodate innovation.

Economic and community benefits (1 respondent, 12%): Notes potential economic benefits such as job creation, with positive impacts on the mental health of residents, balanced against the practical concerns of affordability and viability for providers.

Policy H/AS: Accessible homes and residential space standards

Viability and cost implications (9 respondents, 82%): Financial impacts of meeting M4(2) and M4(3) standards were a concern, with discussions on increased project costs and the necessity to include these in viability assessments.

Impact on accessible housing provision (9 respondents, 82%): Respondents considered trade-offs involving accessibility standards and housing provision. Issues included supporting the needs of elderly and disabled residents, differentiating accessible home types, and implications for community-centric housing delivery.

Local policy justification and evidence base (7 respondents, 64%): Emphasis was on the requirement for a solid local evidence base to justify the need for specific accessibility standards, demanding detailed analysis and clear linkage to local population needs.

Policy flexibility and local needs (7 respondents, 64%): Advocates for a policy that reflects local demographic and site-specific needs, utilising local housing market assessments to inform demand for accessible homes, and allowing variances under justified conditions.

Regulatory overlap and future proofing (7 respondents, 64%): Exploration of Policy H/AS's relationship with existing or upcoming building regulations, the need for policies to complement rather than duplicate regulations, and considerations for future changes in the regulatory landscape.

Policy H/AS: Residential space standards for accessible homes

Impact on Housing Affordability and Viability (4 respondents, 67%): Stakeholders are concerned that enforcing NDSS could potentially lead to fewer homes being built, specifically affordable ones, due to increased costs.

Need for Strategic Integration within Local Plans (4 respondents, 67%): Some stakeholders support the incorporation of NDSS within local plans, rather than applying them through SPDs.

Demand for Justification and Evidence (4 respondents, 67%): A call for council and policymakers to provide clear, evidence-based reasoning behind the adoption of NDSS for all residential developments.

Consideration of Design Flexibility and Alternatives (3 respondents, 50%): A viewpoint suggesting that smaller, yet well-designed homes could meet the objectives of quality living, advocating for a flexible application of NDSS.

Policy Formation Process (2 respondents, 33%): Concerns over the policy-making process, with demands for transparency, public consultation, and independent scrutiny, as opposed to directives issued through SPDs.

Policy H/AS: Residential space standards in market housing

Balancing quality and flexibility in housing standards (6 respondents, 100%): Respondents mentioned the debate on maintaining high standards, such as the nationally described space standard (NDSS), to enhance living conditions while also acknowledging the need for flexibility allowing for well-designed homes that might not meet these standards but still offer acceptable living conditions.

Affordability, choice, and housing diversity (4 respondents, 67%): Some raised concerns that strict space standards could reduce housing affordability and limit buyer choice, suggesting that smaller, functional homes can play a vital role in the market for different budgets and lifestyles.

Impact of NDSS on housing viability and market response (4 respondents, 67%): Concerns were raised about the viability of new developments with the introduction of NDSS, with views expressed on the need for policies to be evidence-based and considerate of economic impacts, and allowing developers to adapt to market demands.

Evidence-based policy making and local authority role (3 respondents, 50%): There's a call for robust evidence to support the adoption of NDSS by local authorities, with policies to be justified, effective, and aligned with local conditions, including consideration of health, economic viability, and urban planning objectives.

Design versus size in housing standards (1 respondent, 17%): It was suggested that attention should shift from size to the quality of design and usability of living spaces, arguing that a well-designed smaller home could meet residents' needs better than a larger, poorly designed one.

Transitional measures and adaptation to new standards (1 respondent, 17%): The importance of a transitional period for developers to adjust to new standards like NDSS was mentioned, considering costs, planning processes, and the necessity for a gradual shift to ensure viability and benefits for all stakeholders.

Policy H/HM: Housing mix

Site-specific flexibility and viability (13 respondents, 87%): Policies should allow for local market demands, site constraints, and economic conditions; inflexible policies risk economic viability and may reduce housing provision.

Diversity in housing types and affordability (13 respondents, 87%): Policies are needed to support diverse housing types and affordable options; overly prescriptive requirements might hinder developers' provision of affordable housing.

Policy clarity and implementation (10 respondents, 67%): Clear guidelines are valued, advocating for flexible compliance conducive to the site-specific context; unclear policies may stall housing delivery.

Evidence-based policymaking (10 respondents, 67%): Housing mix policies must be grounded in robust, local evidence; reliance on broad evidence might not address local demand nuances.

Adapting to market dynamics (9 respondents, 60%): Policies should adapt to market changes, especially in phased developments; concerns exist that too much flexibility may divert from strategic housing needs.

Policy H/BtR: Build to rent developments

Market viability and local needs (3 respondents, 100%): Acknowledges the necessity for policy to recognise Build-to-Rent's (BtR) market viability, stressing that it must address economic feasibility and local housing requirements, and ensure BtR contributes effectively to housing supply tailored to community needs.

Policy and regulation impact (2 respondents, 67%): There is consensus on the need for pro-BtR policies, yet opinions vary on policy stringency; a balanced regulatory approach that encourages growth while complying with planning objectives is favoured.

Location and planning flexibility (1 respondent, 33%): Highlights divergent views on BtR development sites, debating the merits of urban versus rural settings; calls for policies to permit flexible growth across diverse locations without excessive constraints.

Diversity in housing supply (1 respondent, 33%): Emphasises the importance of including BtR in housing plans to diversify the market, arguing for policy integration of BtR without bias, catering to varied housing needs across societal segments.

Policy H/BtR: Location of Build-to-rent schemes

Sustainability and Local Needs (3 respondents, 100%): BtR developments should be integrated with sustainable practices and meet the needs of the local area. Policies must be informed by evidence and tailored to the infrastructure and demographic requirements of different communities.

Location Flexibility and Planning Policy (3 respondents, 100%): Respondents advocate for adaptable planning policies that are not too prescriptive, allowing BtR schemes to respond to market changes and sustainable development needs across a variety of settings, including town centres and suburban zones.

Regulatory Approach and Investment (2 respondents, 67%): Opinions diverge on regulatory approaches, with a leaning towards avoiding stringent regulations that may impede flexibility and innovation in BtR schemes. Policies should be conducive to investment and recognise varied BtR formats.

Housing Supply and Market Impact (2 respondents, 67%): BtR is seen as beneficial for housing supply, particularly in growing areas with housing needs. There are advantages in delivery speed and market absorption, but it's important that developments address real local needs rather than contribute to housing speculation.

Economic and Social Benefits (1 respondent, 33%): Single-ownership BtR developments can attract investment and facilitate placemaking. They also offer social benefits, such as improved housing options for certain demographics, notably the 20-44 age group in need of housing choices.

Policy H/Btr: Affordable private rent discount in build-to-rent schemes

Economic viability of build-to-rent schemes (4 respondents, 80%): Focus on understanding build-to-rent economic models, aiming to balance affordable unit provision with financial project viability. Variable discounts and trade-offs highlighted for maintaining sustainability without compromising affordability.

Affordability and local market dynamics (4 respondents, 80%): Advocacy for rental prices to reflect local market conditions, suggesting rent should be pegged to a percentage of these rates. Emphasis on creating meaningful rent reductions for wider community accessibility.

Policy alignment and national standards (3 respondents, 60%): Consensus on the need for policy to adhere to national standards, particularly the National Planning Policy Framework, to ensure successful affordable housing delivery. Suggestions for policy adaptability to cater to varied site-specific viability.

Flexibility and context-sensitive implementation (2 respondents, 40%): Recognition that diverse site challenges mandate policy flexibility. Proposals for adaptive spatial zoning of affordable rental levels or concessions for complex sites, advocating pragmatic approaches towards land use and affordable housing inclusion.

Impact on local communities (1 respondent, 20%): Concerns about policy effects on community, relating to affordable and accessible housing developments. Discussions on ensuring policies promote community betterment through genuinely affordable housing in build-to-rent schemes.

Policy H/BtR: Affordable private rent homes required in each Build-to-rent development

Viability and affordability balance (5 respondents, 100%): Concerns exist that stringent requirements for affordable private rent homes might impact the viability of BtR projects. There is an acknowledgment of the need for affordable housing for the wider population.

Planning process and viability assessments (3 respondents, 60%): Complexities and potential delays during the planning stage due to viability assessments are a concern. Streamlined processes are needed to ensure efficient planning and safeguard the delivery of affordable units.

Economic distinctions of BtR developments (2 respondents, 40%): BtR's business model, based on long-term rental income, differs from immediate sales models, necessitating tailored planning policies that recognise these economic specifics to ensure project sustainability.

Policy flexibility and local housing needs (2 respondents, 40%): Debate centres on the need for policy flexibility, taking into consideration local housing needs and different housing types, suggesting custom solutions rather than a one-size-fits-all approach.

Localised affordable rent strategies (1 respondent, 20%): Proposals for varied affordable rent levels within BtR developments could meet diverse financial circumstances of residents, with some success examples highlighted.

Long-term vs short-term housing objectives (1 respondent, 20%): Policy adjustments may be needed to better align with the long-term rental income model of BtR, differentiating from the traditional short-term sales focus while addressing affordable housing needs.

Policy H/CL: Location and provision of co-living schemes

Location Flexibility Versus Criteria-based Development (4 respondents, 80%): Policies should support co-living schemes beyond town centres via a criteria-based approach, emphasising accessibility and amenities to integrate into communities and meet sustainability goals.

Sustainability and Accessibility (3 respondents, 60%): Co-living schemes should be placed in areas that encourage sustainable living and provide strong non-car accessibility to bolster environmental benefits and urban integration.

Proximity to Employment and Services (2 respondents, 40%): The placement of co-living spaces near jobs, services, and community facilities is key to enhancing their liveability and supporting vibrant, accessible communities.

Demand and Supply Dynamics (1 respondent, 20%): Planning policies must offer flexibility to meet high rental demand with diverse housing, while avoiding negative impacts on local housing and infrastructure.

Evolving Policy Frameworks (1 respondent, 20%): Housing policies should be adaptable to the changing co-living model, encouraging innovation while ensuring co-living positively impacts housing markets and communities.

Co-living Density and Amenities (1 respondent, 20%): Co-living developments need to balance density with the provision of amenities and communal spaces, contributing positively to urban living without straining resources or local character.

Policy H/CL: Affordable housing provision in co-living schemes

Affordability and Housing Needs (6 respondents, 86%): Respondents discussed how co-living contributes to affordable housing, prompting a re-evaluation of policy to reflect co-living's unique housing solutions.

Viability and Flexibility in Policy Implementation (4 respondents, 57%): Flexibility in policy for co-living schemes' affordable housing was flagged as crucial to balance economic feasibility with policy aims, with a suggestion for viability testing.

Community Impact and Social Housing (4 respondents, 57%): The impact on community welfare and the importance of inclusive policies that cater to diverse demographic needs within co-living schemes were highlighted.

Financial Contributions vs. On-Site Provision (3 respondents, 43%): There is division on whether on-site provision or financial contributions are more effective for fulfilling affordable housing obligations in co-living, with a call for clear calculation methodologies.

Legal and Regulatory Framework (2 respondents, 29%): Respondents mentioned the need for legal clarity and a robust framework that aligns co-living affordable housing policies with current legal practices, including aspects like the community infrastructure levy.

Policy H/CL: Amenity standards in co-living schemes

Amenity Standards Flexibility vs. Regulation (5 respondents, 100%): Stakeholders showcased varied opinions on whether co-living amenity standards should be strictly regulated or flexible to encourage innovation, with emphasis on resident expectations for quality and safety contrasted against a need to avoid stifling creativity.

Innovation vs. Standardisation in Co-Living Schemes (5 respondents, 100%): Respondents deliberated over the tension between fostering innovation and the need for clear guidelines in co-living schemes, balancing the need for adaptability and site-specific solutions against consistent quality and future housing standards.

Communal Spaces and Social Integration (3 respondents, 60%): There is a general consensus on the importance of well-proportioned communal spaces in co-living developments, highlighting their role in encouraging social interaction and fostering a sense of community among residents.

Economic and Market-Driven Approaches to Co-Living Development (3 respondents, 60%): Discussions centred on the extent to which the market should influence co-living scheme outcomes within policy parameters, with suggestions for occasional policy reviews to ensure they remain responsive to changing models and expectations.

Distinction in Housing Categories (1 respondent, 20%): A minority raised the debate on the distinction between conventional apartments and co-living schemes, arguing the necessity for clear differentiation for market clarity, but also acknowledging the potential benefits of flexibility in response to varied resident needs.

Policy H/PBSA: Provision and location of purpose built student accommodation

Housing Supply and Affordability (9 respondents, 90%): Respondents expressed concerns about student housing affecting local housing markets, potentially raising rents and limiting availability for non-students. Some noted that PBSA could ease demand on HMOs and aid overall housing provision if cleverly integrated, whilst others were concerned about a negative impact on efforts to secure affordable housing for all, indicating a need for policies that establish a balance between student and non-student housing.

University Responsibility and Policy Flexibility (8 respondents, 80%): Participants supported the idea that universities ought to take greater accountability for student accommodation, through on-site housing or stronger links with PBSA providers. Opinions indicated that policy flexibility should allow PBSA to develop beyond campus boundaries, fostering accommodation solutions attuned to student numbers and urban growth strategies.

Planning and Policy Review Needs (7 respondents, 70%): Users suggested current policies may be outdated in relation to student housing demands, alluding to the necessity for reviews considering the expansion aims of educational institutions, shifts in urban development, and the details of local housing markets. Respondents highlighted the significance of strategic planning at local and national tiers for harmonizing student accommodation with wider housing and urban planning.

Impact on Local Communities (6 respondents, 60%): A dialogue showcased the balance between accommodating students and protecting local community welfare, noting the transformation and service pressures in areas with high student influx. Yet, proper management of PBSA was also said to potentially rejuvenate spaces and benefit economies. The discourse supported policy formulation to avoid adverse effects such as loss of employment areas and community identity.

Sustainability and Location (3 respondents, 30%): Participants discussed sustainable development and strategic planning for PBSA, raising environmental concerns such as pollution and traffic. Conversely, the repurposing of brownfield sites was seen as favorable. There was support for a balanced approach that safeguards ecological integrity whilst providing sustainable, accessible student accommodation.

Economic and Social Contributions vs. Impacts (1 respondent, 10%): The respondent noted the pros and cons of student populations on local economies and communities. The discussion acknowledged students' financial and social inputs, weighed against the risks of community disruption and infrastructure pressure. A call was made for nuanced policy that equitably assimilates students into city life, contemplating both their impact and contributions.

Policy H/PBSA: Affordable housing or rent in purpose built student accommodation

Equity in Housing Contribution Requirements (7 respondents, 78%): Views differ on whether PBSA should contribute to affordable housing like other developments, with some seeing it necessary for equity, while others feel such contributions would be unjustified.

Affordability and Accessibility for Students (7 respondents, 78%): Stakeholders focus on the need for affordable PBSA to ensure higher education remains accessible to students from all financial backgrounds, recognising the financial burden unaffordable accommodation poses.

Policy Implementation and Viability (5 respondents, 56%): Concerns revolve around the practicality of implementing Policy H/PBSA, with some arguing strict requirements could impact the deliverability of new student accommodations, while others advocate for a balanced, case-by-case application.

Regulatory Framework and Policy Impact (4 respondents, 44%): Discussions highlight uncertainties in fitting policy aspirations within the existing regulatory framework, especially where it may conflict with national policies or maintenance loan limits, favouring implementable and balanced contributions.

Socio-economic Considerations (3 respondents, 33%): Emphasising that student housing should be a facilitator, not a barrier to education, hence some suggest exemptions or financial assistance for developments promoting affordability.

Long-term Local Resident Benefits vs. Transient Student Needs (2 respondents, 22%): Opinions are split between prioritising the immediate housing needs of students and the long-term benefits for permanent residents in the community.

Strategic Planning and Collaboration (1 respondent, 11%): Advocated for are robust strategic planning and collaboration between universities, councils, and developers, to ensure student accommodation policies align with both national housing strategies and local needs.

Supply and Demand Dynamics (1 respondent, 11%): Concerns include the potential impact of PBSA supply on local housing markets, with some concerned that an oversupply could detract from other housing needs and others hoping it might reduce rental costs.

Policy H/SBCHB: Self-build and custom housebuilding

Policy Flexibility and Development Responsiveness (9 respondents, 82%): Policies should be adaptable, avoiding over-prescriptive measures that fail to accommodate market and demand changes; concerns include potential negative outcomes of fixed self-build plot percentages and the suggestion to allow unsold plots to revert to developers after a given period.

Planning and Allocation Challenges (8 respondents, 73%): Efficient land allocation for self-build projects is critical, with views varying on mixed housing support and specific plot allocations; strategic planning is necessary to address potential delivery partner shortages and project scalability.

Developer Constraints and Opportunities for Custom and Self-Build Schemes (8 respondents, 73%): There is developer apprehension about mandated self-build plot inclusions affecting business models and plot suitability, though opportunities are recognised for the role of custom and self-build schemes in creating diverse communities.

Diversity and Community Needs versus Market Demands (4 respondents, 36%): While some advocate for policies under 'option a' to increase housing diversity, developers raise feasibility concerns regarding integrating self-build elements which could impact affordable housing provision and site complexities against market dynamics.

Economic Viability and Resources for Self-Builders (3 respondents, 27%): Highlighting economic barriers, a need is identified for policy support that makes self-build projects more financially accessible, attracting a wider range of self-build participants.

Impact on Rural Development and Flood Risk Management (1 respondent, 9%): Emphasis is placed on considering environmental sustainability within self-build policies, including careful site selection and adherence to flood risk management to ensure responsible rural development.

Policy H/GT: Gypsies, travellers and travelling show people

Flood Risk Management and Site Allocation (1 respondent, 100%): Emphasises the need to select sites for gypsies, travellers, and travelling show people that are at reduced risk of flooding. Sequential testing must reflect NPPF guidelines to ensure suitability and address flood risks, balancing the safety of vulnerable communities with site availability challenges.

Sustainable Development Practices (1 respondent, 100%): Stresses planning for mitigations against climate change-induced flood risks for sites destined for gypsies, travellers, and travelling show people. Sustainable design, maintenance, and updating of flood defences are considered critical for community resilience amidst increasing climate threats.

Policy H/M: Moorings

Policy clarity and regulation (3 respondents, 50%): Stresses the need for clearer definitions and regulations specific to different types of moorings.

Sustainability and accessibility of mooring sites (3 respondents, 50%): Addresses the importance of sustainable development and ensuring access to essential services at new mooring sites while considering environmental impacts.

Environmental and heritage conservation (2 respondents, 33%): Calls for protection measures of ecosystems and heritage sites against potential impacts from mooring developments.

Financial and resource considerations (2 respondents, 33%): Considers the financial and resource allocation required for development and maintenance of mooring sites, balancing costs with infrastructure needs.

Safety and flood risk management (2 respondents, 33%): Highlights the need for safety measures, emergency planning and flood risk assessments at mooring sites.

Education and community infrastructure (1 respondent, 17%): Discusses the need to consider the implications of residential moorings on local community infrastructure and services.

Climate change

Policy C/RD: Sustainable construction for new residential development

Carbon Neutrality and Sustainable Construction Ambitions (37 respondents, 90%): Opinions vary on the council's aim for carbon neutrality and stricter sustainable construction standards. Praise for high sustainability ambitions coexist with concerns over practicality, enforceability, and potential impacts on housing affordability and supply.

Energy Efficiency Standards and Building Regulations (36 respondents, 88%): A significant dialogue involves the relationship between local energy efficiency policies and national building regulations. Debate exists between the merits of ambitious local standards and the complexities they introduce compared to a preference for national standardisation.

National vs. Local Standards Dilemma (30 respondents, 73%): Respondents discuss whether local authorities should set standards stricter than national benchmarks. Views differ on whether local standards should exceed national policies to serve public benefit and demonstrate climate change leadership.

Viability and Deliverability of New Developments (23 respondents, 56%): Concerns focus on balancing sustainability goals with the practicality and affordability of new residential developments. Suggestions include the need for a progressive policy application and flexibility to adapt to evolving standards.

Affordability and Social Equity in Sustainable Development (7 respondents, 17%): Discussions highlight potential issues of stringent sustainability mandates on housing affordability, emphasising the necessity to consider social and economic factors alongside environmental goals.

Renewable Energy Integration and Infrastructure Challenges (6 respondents, 15%): Support for renewable energy solutions is tempered by awareness of challenges such as conflicts with development objectives and limitations of the current energy grid.

Historic Preservation vs. Sustainability (1 respondent, 2%): Preservation of world heritage sites is noted as important while pursuing sustainable construction objectives, suggesting the need for policies that integrate sustainability with conservation efforts.

Policy C/NRB: Sustainable construction for non-residential buildings

Climate Change Mitigation and Construction Standards (8 respondents, 80%): Need for sustainable construction to address climate change recognised; policies need to balance ambition with the practicalities of diverse non-residential buildings.

Energy Efficiency and Metrics (6 respondents, 60%): Debate on specific metrics versus standard assumptions for energy efficiency; necessity for adaptable policies due to building use variability stressed.

Impact on Development Viability (3 respondents, 30%): Concerns about sustainable construction standards affecting new developments' feasibility; discussions reflect the tension between environmental goals and economic viability.

Financial Aspects and Policy Support Mechanisms (2 respondents, 20%): Carbon neutrality in construction could be aided by financial mechanisms like carbon offset funds; discussions on cost-bearing for compliance vary.

Future-Proofing and Evolution of Standards (2 respondents, 20%): Importance of developing policies that evolve with technological and methodological advances to sustain innovation and relevance.

Role of Lighting and External Factors (1 respondent, 10%): Minimising rural external lighting discussed in the broader context of energy use, ecological impacts, and diverse sustainability considerations.

Policy C/EC: Embodied carbon

Striking a balance between refurbishment and new builds (13 respondents, 57%): Respondents mentioned prioritising refurbishment of buildings over new constructions to reduce carbon output but also acknowledged that in some instances, new builds might be the more carbon-efficient choice.

Concerns over operational versus embodied carbon emissions (11 respondents, 48%): Discussions noted that focusing solely on operational efficiency can lead to the oversight of embodied carbon. Advocates for a policy that recognises the carbon cost of construction and operational emissions.

Demand for clear, accessible guidelines and targets (8 respondents, 35%): Clear and achievable embodied carbon targets are needed due to the lack of national policy and challenges using third-party data. Call for standardised national benchmarks.

Impact on housing delivery and viability (7 respondents, 30%): Concerns that strict embodied carbon regulations could harm the financial viability of housing projects, affecting affordability and development pace. Express the need for balance between carbon reduction and development.

Integration with broader environmental and social strategies (5 respondents, 22%): Suggestions for embodied carbon policies to be part of larger strategies addressing climate change and housing needs, promoting policies that support sustainability and socioeconomic benefits.

Necessity for collaboration and expertise (4 respondents, 17%): Collaboration with experts in sustainable development is essential for effective embodied carbon policy implementation, given the complexity of reducing embodied carbon.

Material availability and sustainable use concerns (3 respondents, 13%): Awareness of the environmental impact of material production underlines discussions about sustainable material use in construction, with an emphasis on innovative use and lifecycle assessment of materials.

Policy C/RET: Renewable energy target

Target Setting and Adaptability (15 respondents, 88%): Users request precise, ambitious renewable energy targets, like a 300mw local plan capacity. They highlight the need for targets that adapt to new technologies and evidence, but caution against overly flexible goals that could obscure progress measurement.

Policy Coherence and Regulatory Framework (14 respondents, 82%): There's a call for aligning renewable energy targets with broader climate commitments and national frameworks. Concerns are raised about potential loopholes in too flexible targets that might hinder achieving carbon neutrality.

Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting (10 respondents, 59%): Clear, measurable renewable energy goals are deemed essential for effective monitoring and justification of renewable projects. Users suggest regular target reviews to remain aligned with current evidence, yet warn against excessive flexibility complicating progress assessment.

Local Implementation and Technological Considerations (5 respondents, 29%): Support is shown for maximising local deployment of renewable energy following national guidelines. Innovative suggestions include solar PV on commercial rooftops and equipping homes with solar panels, alongside rapid deployment of wind turbines and advancements in energy storage.

Policy C/REA: Renewable energy approach

Strategic Planning and Local Development (17 respondents, 81%): Focus on integrating renewable energy into local development plans to quicken planning processes; some concerns over landscape impacts and area suitability.

Regulatory and Planning Frameworks (16 respondents, 76%): Importance of clear regulatory and planning environments to facilitate renewable energy adoption; issues raised about conflicts with national landscape protections.

Economic and Environmental Trade-offs (7 respondents, 33%): Debate over urgent climate action versus long-term sustainability, with worries about landscape, biodiversity, and food security from greenfield solar sites.

Policy Flexibility and Innovation (5 respondents, 24%): Need for policies that accommodate evolving technologies; while some favour wind energy, others advocate for a broader approach to include various renewable sources.

Environmental and Wildlife Conservation (4 respondents, 19%): Calls for renewable energy projects designed to support rather than harm biodiversity; the challenge is balancing infrastructure needs with conservation.

Grid Capacity and Energy Storage (1 respondent, 5%): Acknowledgement of the need to upgrade grid capacity and establish energy storage solutions, considering the investments required to update networks.

Community Involvement and Economic Benefits (1 respondent, 5%): Suggestions for greater community engagement and economic returns from renewable projects; some scepticism about the feasibility of community-led models.

Nature and ecosystem services

Policy N/SHS: Sites, habitats and species

Policy and planning for ecological improvement (13 respondents, 100%): Support for increased habitat connectivity and species diversity, with recommendations for clearer guidelines on habitat protection, biodiversity net gain, and the creation of green infrastructure.

Addressing development impacts on local biodiversity (10 respondents, 77%): Concerns over recent developments impacting green spaces and biodiversity, with calls for development projects to preserve wildlife spaces and enhance green infrastructure.

Urban greening and biodiversity enhancement (7 respondents, 54%): A desire for more ambitious green urban environments, including green roofs and connected habitats, to serve wildlife and city dwellers, ensuring ecological balance post-development.

Enhancement of rural and peripheral green spaces (6 respondents, 46%): Improved accessibility and management of countryside areas for public and wildlife benefits are highlighted, alongside potential biodiversity contributions through rewilding and habitat creation.

Challenges with biodiversity net gain (BNG) metric (4 respondents, 31%): Recognition of BNG benefits but concerns that the metric undervalues habitats with contextual biodiversity significance, suggesting policy amendments for urban environments and common habitats.

The importance of habitat connectivity and wildlife corridors (2 respondents, 15%): Emphasising the need for habitat connectivity and diverse ecosystems through policy and practical implementation, involving green corridors and valuing rural sites for their biodiversity contributions.

Comparative and inspirational models for habitat preservation (2 respondents, 15%): References to successful habitat preservation models from other cities and regions to inspire more effective conservation and urban greening strategies.

Balancing recreation and conservation (1 respondent, 8%): Concern about conflicts between recreational activities and conservation in sensitive areas, and the necessity of harmonious coexistence.

Policy N/BNG: Biodiversity net gain

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Ambition Levels (49 respondents, 88%): Opinions vary on BNG target ambition, with some advocating strict adherence to the statutory 10% and others recommending higher thresholds. Detractors warn of adverse impacts on development viability and housing affordability.

Policy Adaptation and Update Needs (29 respondents, 52%): Calls for policy evolution to align with modern guidelines and emerging local strategies are prominent, recognising the need for a dynamic regulatory framework while maintaining development viability.

Incorporation of Flexible and Holistic Approaches (27 respondents, 48%): Respondents support tailored BNG approaches that account for local conditions and ecological priorities, favouring qualitative assessments and integration with wider environmental strategies.

Impacts on Housing and Development Viability (23 respondents, 41%): Concerns relate to how stricter BNG requirements might limit affordable housing provision and impose burdens on small to medium-sized developers, highlighting the need to balance conservation efforts with housing and economic growth.

On-site vs. Off-site BNG Delivery and Management (20 respondents, 36%): There is a preference for on-site biodiversity enhancements and concerns over the management of off-site gains. Discussions include the challenges of on-site delivery and the need for clear, enforceable management guidelines.

Evidential Support and Viability Assessments (7 respondents, 12%): A pragmatic approach to policy-making is called for, with robust evidence and detailed assessments underpinning BNG policies, ensuring ambitious biodiversity targets do not hinder development goals.

Community and Stakeholder Engagement in BNG Planning (1 respondent, 2%): There is a demand for greater inclusion of communities and stakeholders in the development of BNG policies, with an emphasis on local nature recovery strategies and community benefits.

Policy N/GI: Green infrastructure

Bolstering Green Infrastructure (20 respondents, 74%): Strong support for the enhancement of green infrastructure, with diverse opinions on approaches, underscoring flexibility, evidence-based policymaking, and the balance between environmental goals and development practicality.

Policy Flexibility and Development Viability (15 respondents, 56%): Tension between the need for policy flexibility and maintaining the viability of new developments, with caution against too prescriptive or lenient policies.

Strategic GI Planning and Local Specificity (13 respondents, 48%): Advocacy for strategic GI planning that incorporates local characteristics and leverages local knowledge, ensuring fidelity to local green spaces and community attributes.

The Interface of GI Policies with Other Legislation (10 respondents, 37%): Emphasis on the alignment of GI policies with broader legislative frameworks, seeking a balance between statutory requirements and local aspirations.

Biodiversity Net Gain and Species-Specific Considerations (8 respondents, 30%): Strong advocacy for GI policies to support national biodiversity net gain objectives and to include strategies considering the impact on specific species.

Evidence-Based Policy Making and Implementation Challenges (7 respondents, 26%): Recurrent calls for GI policies to be underpinned by comprehensive evidence, viability assessments, and strategic environmental considerations.

Health, Wellbeing, and Environmental Benefits (5 respondents, 19%): Consensus on the positive impact of green infrastructure on health, well-being, and the environment, with recognition of potential design and implementation challenges.

Integration with Existing Urban and Rural Landscapes (5 respondents, 19%): Importance placed on integrating GI policies with urban and rural landscapes, ensuring advancements benefit both, and address connectivity issues in rural areas.

Policy N/OS: Open spaces

Policy Clarity and Flexibility (10 respondents, 91%): Diverse views on policy flexibility; some favour adaptability to local needs while others seek clear standards for consistency and certainty for developers.

Development Viability and Standards (5 respondents, 45%): Concerns about balancing stringent open space standards with development viability, aiming for a compromise that supports growth without compromising space quality.

Sports and Recreation Provision (2 respondents, 18%): Stresses the inclusion of sports and recreation in policy considerations, with a focus on protecting facilities and informed by community needs.

Equity in Access to Open Spaces (1 respondent, 9%): Highlights the need for equitable access to open spaces across all community members, integrating social justice in urban planning.

Flood Risk Management (1 respondent, 9%): Recognises open spaces should also address environmental concerns, like flood risk management, calling for multifunctional space designs.

Historical and Recreational Value (1 respondent, 9%): Supports recognising local green spaces for their historical and recreational importance, and the value they add to communities.

Green Infrastructure and Open Space Distinction (1 respondent, 9%): Advocates for clear demarcation between open space and green infrastructure, requiring distinct policies for each.

Policy N/TWC: Trees and woodland conservation

Climate Change and Ecological Responses (13 respondents, 68%): Respondents advocated for tree and woodland conservation as means to tackle climate change, improve air quality, and promote biodiversity; they called for ambitious tree canopy targets and integration of trees as carbon sinks in developments.

Policy Clarity and Management (10 respondents, 53%): Contributors sought clearer guidelines to harmonize trees and woodland conservation with environmental and development policies, emphasizing the need for sustainable development and proper management of planted trees.

Policy Implementation Challenges (8 respondents, 42%): Frustrations were expressed about the current state of policy implementation, where developments sometimes neglect tree conservation; respondents suggested more rigorous conservation requirements in new developments.

Balancing Urban Development and Conservation (6 respondents, 32%): The need to adjust policies to achieve a balance between urban development and nature conservation was discussed, with suggestions for incorporating more greenery in cities and extending conservation to rural areas.

Health and Wellbeing Considerations (4 respondents, 21%): The health benefits of integrating trees and green spaces in urban and housing developments were highlighted, with a push for policies that promote residents' health and well-being through such green inclusions.

N/CELLC: Conserving and Enhancing the Landscape and Landscape Character

Information and guidance updating (1 respondent, 100%): Respondents express concerns about the outdated information affecting landscape policies. Emphasise the need for current data to better align with environmental challenges and regulation.

Policy scope and inclusivity (1 respondent, 100%): Push for broader policy coverage to protect and enhance non-designated landscapes as well, recognising their ecological and visual importance.

Regulatory enhancement for ecological recovery (1 respondent, 100%): Advocacy for adapting policies to improve ecological recovery schemes in non-designated landscapes, to offer targeted conservation support.

N/LCS: Landscape character and setting of settlements

Policy adequacy and updates (18 respondents, 90%): Debate over the effectiveness of current policies, with views split, where some respondents state these policies match national and local strategies, while others suggest they require updates, especially to tackle the ambiguity around non-designated landscapes and to prevent unwanted developments.

Specific area protections (11 respondents, 55%): Many respondents focus on the necessity of shielded spaces, particularly the A4 westbound into Bath and its surrounding green corridors, stressing their importance as entries to the city and warranting explicit policy protection to conserve locality and environmental quality.

Balance between development and preservation (11 respondents, 55%): Equally discussed, with opinions on how best to manage the dichotomy between required development for housing and employment and the conservation of green spots, skylines, and corridors, suggesting a reach for balanced policies that consider both progress and protection.

Community and heritage considerations (10 respondents, 50%): A sentiment emphasising the need to maintain local character and protect significant gateways, especially around world heritage sites, hinting at a preference for policies to put heritage and the unique identities of communities at the forefront of development plans.

Evidence-based and future-proof policies (5 respondents, 25%): Some respondents suggest policies should be grounded in substantial evidence and have the flexibility for future change, acknowledging the transformative nature of landscapes which may pivot due to land use amendments, greenbelt shifts, and evolving priorities.

Integration with wider environmental goals (4 respondents, 20%): Support for harmonising policies that govern landscapes with comprehensive environmental objectives appears in discussions, such as enhancing tree cover on roadsides and natural spaces, reflecting a view of landscape protection as part of a broader environmental strategy.

Objective and specific policy language (1 respondent, 5%): Critique around policy wording being too subjective is voiced by a few, with suggestions for more definitive, objective criteria to replace vague terms, aiming for increased clarity and less arbitrary interpretation in the application of policy.

Policy N/CELLC

Policy Integration with Environmental Legislation (1 respondent, 100%):
Respondents mentioned the need for Policy N/CELLC to align with environmental
conservation objectives as outlined in the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023. The
policy should not only be legally compliant but also proactive in protecting landscapes
and enhancing natural heritage. This could lead to increased tourism and recreation but
may impose constraints on development and necessitate a balance between
conservation and socio-economic needs.

Policy N/RFSD: Flood risk management and sustainable drainage

Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) Implementation (28 respondents, 93%): Strong support indicated for incorporating SuDS in developments of all scales.

Climate Change Adaptation (14 respondents, 47%): Concerns discussed about flood risk models becoming outdated due to climate change enhancing flood frequency and severity.

Regulatory Framework and Compliance (12 respondents, 40%): Calls identified for updated regulations that account for modern challenges and include climate adaptation.

Infrastructure and Urban Development Pressures (9 respondents, 30%): Increased urbanisation and impermeable surfaces noted to intensify flood risks.

Policy and Planning Integration (7 respondents, 23%): A disconnect between existing flood risk management strategies and wider planning policies highlighted.

Public and Environmental Health (7 respondents, 23%): Flood risk management linked to wider public and environmental health concerns.

Policy N/ES: Ecosystem services

Policy Effectiveness and Implementation (26 respondents, 90%): Feedback indicates a disparity between the policy's objectives and its actual enactment; criticisms point to ambiguity in policies and poor adherence by developers and local authorities. Stakeholders press for the policy to be made more explicit, stringent, and enforced to embed ecosystem services into development decisions. This highlights a tension between the need for precise policy and the practicalities of enforcement.

Wildlife Corridors and Urban Biodiversity (20 respondents, 69%): There is a robust endorsement for maintaining wildlife corridors, with a call for policies to be amended to protect these ecological networks from the impacts of development. Proposals like incorporating swift bricks in new buildings are suggested, yet there is concern over the efficacy of policy enforcement and its implications for biodiversity.

Stakeholder Involvement and Local Authority Action (8 respondents, 28%): Respondents argue for increased participation from local authorities in upholding ecosystem service policies, with some councils already taking proactive steps. There is an expectation for councils to reflect climate emergency commitments in their planning processes, balancing stakeholder aspirations with the complexity of policy and community expectations.

Nature-Based Solutions vs. Grey Infrastructure (7 respondents, 24%): A preference for nature-based solutions over traditional infrastructure is evident, with their benefits in multifunctionality, cost-effectiveness, and resilience against climate change being praised. Inclusion of such solutions in policy frameworks is suggested to optimise natural capital and ecosystem service delivery, juxtaposing the potential for sustainable development with existing policy integration challenges.

Engagement with Environmental Research and Best Practices (6 respondents, 21%): A call for policies informed by contemporary environmental research and best practices, following guidance from entities like Natural England and CIEEM, is voiced. Mandatory biodiversity features in development are debated, balancing policy-driven environmental progress against the hurdles in applying new ecological insights to development controls.

Policy N/EN: Ecological networks and nature recovery - local nature recovery strategies

Strategic Implementation and Local Nature Recovery Strategies (LNRS) (12 respondents, 92%): Strong support for aligning local plans with LNRS to prioritize ecosystem services and nature recovery.

Policy and Planning Enhancements for Ecological Networks (6 respondents, 46%): Calls for nature recovery to be explicitly included in policies, with updates to Policy NE5 and changes to NE4 for better alignment with natural environment guidance.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) and Metric Concerns (4 respondents, 31%): Debate over the statutory BNG metric's application and limitations, including whether it should include features like bird boxes.

Urban Wildlife and Architectural Biodiversity (3 respondents, 23%): Recognition of the built environment as important for urban wildlife, suggesting ecological integration into architectural design.

Integration of Biodiversity in Building Practices (3 respondents, 23%): Discussions on including wildlife-friendly features like swift bricks in buildings, emphasizing sustainability, aesthetics, and urban biodiversity at no extra cost.

Waterways and Landscape Conservation (2 respondents, 15%): Recommendations for extensive mapping of waterways and landscapes to identify nature recovery opportunities.

Public and Community Engagement in Nature Recovery (1 respondent, 8%): Highlighting the role of local community data collection in identifying development contributions to nature recovery networks.

Green Belt

Housing Needs vs. Green Belt Protection (26 respondents, 90%): Respondents discussed the conflict between the need for additional housing and the protection of green belt areas, advocating for flexible policies to balance environmental and community interests with development.

Development Strategy and Land Use (23 respondents, 79%): Strategies such as using brownfield sites and infill development were suggested to house people without compromising green belt goals, highlighting the need to avoid urban sprawl through strategic planning.

Comparison of Development Options (19 respondents, 66%): Specific solutions like 'option b' were debated with an aim to integrate housing needs while preserving village character and respecting green belt values.

Policy and Regulation Framework (9 respondents, 31%): The effectiveness of national and local policies, including the NPPF and EPPS, was questioned, with calls for updates to reflect modern perspectives on environmental protection and housing demand.

Local Community and Economy (9 respondents, 31%): Importance was placed on development that supports the local economy and community characteristics, with an emphasis on projects that align with local needs and preferences.

Environmental Concerns and Sustainability (8 respondents, 28%): Concerns were raised about the environmental impact of development, with suggestions for prioritising low-impact growth and enhancing green belt areas for biodiversity and ecological connections.

Public Participation and Trust (2 respondents, 7%): The need for local participation in planning and decision-making was stressed to build trust and ensure policies align with community values and needs.

Jobs and economy

Policy J/O: Office Development and Change of Use

Trust and implementation in development processes (2 respondents, 67%): Concerns about the trustworthiness of developers and balancing strict approach with a need for flexibility in development policies are highlighted.

Flexibility and viability of conversion policies (2 respondents, 67%): Debates on the rigid nature of conversion policies, advocating for more adaptable approach versus the risk of losing valuable industrial spaces without economic justification.

Economic impact and growth considerations (2 respondents, 67%): Views vary between concerns over the impact of losing industrial space on economic growth and suggestions for policies to promote economic benefits, possibly through more liberal conversion approach.

Long-term use and sustainability of spaces (1 respondent, 33%): Awareness of industrial constructions' shorter lifespan vis-à-vis residential lifespan with a preference for developments with longer-term utility.

Clarification and specification in policy language (1 respondent, 33%): Requests clearer policy language to avoid misinterpretation and ensure positive development outcomes.

Policy J/I: Strategic industrial locations and locally significant industrial sites

Economic viability and potential for prosperity (3 respondents, 100%): Respondents raised issues about the current policy possibly not supporting long-term economic progress, arguing for a more inclusive approach that embraces a wider array of investments and job creation opportunities.

Deployment and utilisation of strategic sites (3 respondents, 100%): Some responses highlighted the need for policy flexibility in the use of strategic and brownfield sites, calling for an allowance of varied employment-generating uses.

Regional specific concerns and the need for localised approaches (2 respondents, 67%): Respondents signalled the importance of tailoring policy to regional characteristics and demands, suggesting a one-size-fits-all policy might not address each area's unique economic context.

Flexibility vs. rigidity in policy design (2 respondents, 67%): There's tension between the desire for a flexible policy that adjusts to market shifts and the current policy's perceived narrow focus, with a caveat that too much flexibility might detract from maintaining space for important sectors.

Policy clarity and implementation concerns (1 respondent, 33%): There were calls for clearer wording in the policy to avoid ambiguities and ensure that policy objectives are understandable and achievable, with a directive towards a broader spectrum of permissible uses.

Policy J/UI: Undesignated industrial sites

Industrial space management and sustainability (4 respondents, 100%): Concerns over managing the shortage of industrial spaces while incorporating sustainable development, such as ecotourism, to balance economic growth with environmental preservation.

Flexibility and adaptability of policy (3 respondents, 75%): Suggestions for Policy J/UI to be more adaptable to diverse local needs, including repurposing old sites, while safeguarding industrial uses and allowing for sustainable development.

Policy implementation and effectiveness (3 respondents, 75%): Discussions on the need for more robust approach to Policy J/UI, preventing misuse by certain developments, coupled with calls for national policy revisions as concern raised the policy will regularly be circumvented by Class E use (which allows change of uses within the E use class without the need for planning permission).

.

Policy J/EM: Employment and skills

Local Workforce Empowerment and Skill Development (11 respondents, 100%): Advocacy for prioritising local labour and providing training in sustainable practices, with a view to address unemployment and contribute to climate change mitigation, albeit with concerns over potential neglect of sectors like heritage.

Sustainability and Climate Change Mitigation (8 respondents, 73%): Support for local workforce training in sustainable building practices to address climate change, acknowledging the need to balance this with other local economic interests.

Educational Overhaul and Community Support (2 respondents, 18%): Criticism of a skewed emphasis on academic education over practical skills, suggesting that reform should favour community-focused training that benefits local businesses.

Innovative Agricultural Practices (1 respondent, 9%): Endorsement of expanding local farming expertise in regenerative practices, signalling the employment-environment nexus within agriculture and the need for inclusive policy crafting.

Enhanced Local Services and Infrastructure Support (1 respondent, 9%): Recommendation for better training advisory services, indicating a gap in policy planning for skill development and training infrastructure support.

Economic Impact and Diversification (1 respondent, 9%): Acknowledgement of policy efforts in job creation yet highlighting a lack of focus on economic diversification, specifically the omission of the heritage economy, which calls for a balanced job market.

Healthy, vibrant and inclusive communities

Policy HVC/TC: Town centre retail hierarchy and development

Economic Vitality and Retail Strategy (6 respondents, 100%): Emphasis on the need for vibrant and adaptable retail sectors in town centres, with a push for clarity and proactive management to balance economic growth and conservation of town centre character and accessibility.

Policy Integration and Specification (4 respondents, 67%): Policy on promotion of Town centres within the strategic sections is sought,. Respondents disappointed with lack of details and seek comprehensive policy frameworks and more explicit commitment to local centres protection citing Larkhall.

Urban Regeneration and Space Utilisation (3 respondents, 50%): Promotion of urban regeneration and mixed-use developments to boost employment and make better use of space, underpinned by centralised services and public transport. Calls for clearer planning on retail development allocations in local centres.

Transport and Accessibility Concerns (3 respondents, 50%): Support for improved transport infrastructure to meet net-zero emissions aims and 30-minute cycle ride accessibility. Respondents favour the '15-minute city' model for better town centre access while indicating a gap in current transport infrastructure and assessment efficacy.

Environmental and Sustainability Goals (1 respondent, 17%): Advocacy for alignment with broader environmental targets such as the net-zero transport plan, incorporating detailed impact assessments to aid sustainability in new developments. Acknowledgement of challenges in current strategies to meet environmental objectives.

Policy HVC/TCD: Town, district and local centre development

Preservation of Retail Functions (2 respondents, 67%): Emphasises maintaining the retail identity of town and local centres, balancing traditional retail protection with adaptability to new retail behaviours.

Accessibility and Convenience (1 respondent, 33%): Highlights the need for local shopping districts to be readily accessible and support the community's lifestyle with services in close proximity.

Expansion and Inclusion in Local Centres (1 respondent, 33%): Discusses opinions on defining the geographical scope of local centres to ensure they include essential services and buildings while avoiding overexpansion.

Policy HVC/LS: Dispersed local shops

Community building and local economy support (3 respondents, 100%): Distributed local shops are seen to strengthen community bonds and support the local economy by encouraging residents to shop locally.

Environmental considerations and travel reduction (2 respondents, 67%): The policy is recognised for its potential to lower carbon emissions by reducing the need for long-distance travel, especially in areas with limited public transport.

Improved accessibility and convenience (2 respondents, 67%): The dispersion of local shops is appreciated for its substantial reduction in travel times and added convenience, particularly for those far from urban centres or without efficient public transportation.

Focus on essential goods and services (1 respondent, 33%): There is a call for local shops to prioritise essential goods and services to ensure they meet the core needs of the community effectively.

Policy HVC/H: Health and wellbeing

Promotion of Healthy Lifestyles via Infrastructure and Policy (5 respondents, 62%): Advocacy for policies promoting healthy lifestyles through improved public realm accessibility, active travel, and sustainable transport; requires collaboration among stakeholders.

Integration of Green Spaces and Active Travel (4 respondents, 50%): Need for high-quality green spaces and safe green corridors in urban planning to enhance physical and mental well-being, with inclusivity and safety as key considerations.

Health Impact Assessments (HIA) (4 respondents, 50%): Support for including HIA in planning to evaluate health outcomes from urban developments; simplifying policy framework is suggested for efficiency.

Engagement and Measurement in Health Policy Implementation (3 respondents, 38%): Calls for engaging healthcare professionals in HIA development and use of measurable metrics like WHOQOL for assessing quality of life improvements post-policy implementation.

Mental Well-being through Nature Connectedness (2 respondents, 25%): Creating tranquil areas and inclusive features in greenspaces to connect with nature and improve mental well-being, with planned accommodations for diverse needs.

Economic Perspectives on Health and Wellbeing (1 respondent, 12%): Investment in parks and green spaces justified by potential long-term savings in health and social care services, emphasizing the economic benefits of wellbeing policies.

Policy HVC/HIA: Health impact assessments

Health Impact Assessments (HIAs) in Development Projects (4 respondents, 80%): Strong support for systemic implementation of HIAs across major developments, with a balance sought between comprehensive health implications analysis and avoiding excessive burden on developers.

Policy Implementation Challenges and Solutions (3 respondents, 60%): Discussions highlighted the complexity of implementing HVC/HIA policy, emphasizing the need for clear guidance and simple procedures to increase compliance, involving NHS and establishing evidence-based thresholds.

Community and Stakeholder Engagement (2 respondents, 40%): Respondents indicated the importance of transparent policy-making, requiring evidence for HIA thresholds and advocating for increased commentary rights for stakeholders, including groups like the SMV.

Incorporation of Health Services in Planning (1 respondent, 20%): Recognition of the need to integrate healthcare facilities in new developments to meet the growing healthcare demands of larger populations, while considering resource allocation challenges.

Policy HVC/CF: Community facilities

Support and Provision for Community Facilities (5 respondents, 71%): Respondents discuss the need for policies to support and enhance community facilities, particularly in accessible locations within small villages, including the integration of green infrastructure.

Open Space as a Community Asset (4 respondents, 57%): There is a call for recognising the value of open spaces, such as green spaces, within the community facilities framework, for the health and well-being benefits they provide.

Community Facilities Definition and Inclusion (4 respondents, 57%): Debates focus on what should be included under the community facilities definition, with some suggesting a broader scope that encompasses green spaces like community gardens.

Decision-making Criteria for Facility Retention or Repurposing (3 respondents, 43%): Discussions centre around the need for clear criteria in decision-making when determining the retention or repurposing of community facilities, taking into account the presence of community need and the viability of alternatives.

Balancing NHS Estate Flexibility with Community Needs (2 respondents, 29%): Points are raised about the tension between NHS estate flexibility for improved patient care, and the community's desire to retain such sites for community uses, acknowledging different impacts and exploring alternatives.

Alternative Uses and Community Innovation (1 respondent, 14%): There is mention of encouraging creative repurposing of sites deemed surplus for community benefit, contrasting with concerns about delays in healthcare improvements caused by such deliberations.

Policy HVC/PS: Safeguarding land for primary school use

Community Support for Educational Infrastructure (2 respondents, 100%): Support for policies that reserve land for educational purposes, emphasising the importance of outdoor spaces for schools and the need for careful consideration of land use priorities.

Preservation of Educational Spaces (2 respondents, 100%): Strong consensus on the necessity of safeguarding land for primary school use, including protecting areas around schools like East Harptree Primary School, while acknowledging potential land allocation challenges.

Policy HVC/PSC: Primary school capacity

Sustainable transport challenges and solutions (1 respondent, 100%): The policy on primary school capacity touches upon the need for adaptations in rural areas, particularly focusing on sustainable transport solutions that ensure equitable access to education, whilst acknowledging geographical and infrastructural constraints.

Policy HVC/C: Safeguarding land for cemeteries

Land Need and Utilisation for Cemetery Expansion (3 respondents, 100%): There is a noted requirement for more space for cemeteries, with a debate over suitable areas for expansion such as underused garages or green fields. Concerns centre on the environmental repercussions and finding community-beneficial uses for derelict spaces, as local cemeteries like St. Mary's Church are nearing capacity.

Environmental Considerations in Cemetery Site Selection (1 respondent, 33%): Environmental impact assessments, particularly focusing on protected species such as bats in Special Areas of Conservation, are a critical part of selecting new cemetery sites. The discussion indicates a community's weight on balancing the necessity for more burial grounds with environmental conservation efforts.

Policy HVC/A: Protecting allotments

Policy strength and allotment protection (85 respondents, 79%): Policy LCR 8 deemed insufficient for safeguarding allotments, with call for stronger protections to prevent eviction of allotment holders, particularly in Combe Down area and loss of valued community spaces.

Allotment demand and supply challenges (80 respondents, 74%): Long waiting lists for allotments in Bath signify mismatch between demand and availability, highlighting difficulties in creating new sites and the pressure from new housing developments.

Developer contributions and replacement allotment sites (63 respondents, 58%): Developers expected to provide not just financial but physical replacement of allotments, with quality sites located appropriately to sustain community allotment needs.

Environmental and community impact (30 respondents, 28%): Allotments seen as environmentally beneficial for biodiversity and ecological balance, with some concerns about negative implications of expansion such as increased traffic and local wildlife disruption.

Access and safety concerns (25 respondents, 23%): Issues around vehicular access and parking following allotment expansion, notably at Combe Down, with fears over road infrastructure, traffic increases, and pedestrian safety.

Cultural and health value of allotments (19 respondents, 18%): Allotments valued for mental health, community bonding, educational benefits, and cultural significance; crucial to community identity and warranting integration in urban planning.

Communication and policy transparency (4 respondents, 4%): Dissatisfaction with clarity and inclusivity of consultation processes relating to allotment policies, highlighting a desire for more transparent communication and decision-making from the council.

Policy HVC/B: Broadband connection at new residential properties

Regulatory Stability and Changes (2 respondents, 100%): Perspectives vary on how the policy fits with the existing regulatory framework. Some see the policy as a beneficial addition, promoting regulation stability. Meanwhile, concerns arise from a parish council suggesting the policy may be unnecessary due to evolving regulations.

Local Governance and Policy Reception (1 respondent, 50%): Acceptance levels of the policy vary among local governance, such as parish councils; alignment with local and national regulations is pivotal for effective policy implementation.

Policy HVC/LGS: Local green spaces

Community Engagement and Value (126 respondents, 90%): Combe Down allotments and other local green spaces seen as crucial community assets, demonstrated by petitions and proposals for community management; valued for recreational, aesthetic, historical significance; challenge in balancing development with community desires.

Environmental Conservation and Biodiversity (113 respondents, 81%): Strong desire to protect local green spaces for wildlife habitats, food security, and biodiversity; encouraging protective designations to balance ecological safeguarding with urban development; allotments valued for conserving underground minerals and supporting biodiversity.

Planning and Policy Challenges (102 respondents, 73%): Noted complexities in planning and policy frameworks protecting local green spaces; the procedural need for more in-depth examination and transparency; a call for stronger policies to protect valuable community assets like the Combe Down allotments against developmental pressures.

Potential for Future Development and Alternatives (68 respondents, 49%): Concerns expressed about new developments impacting green spaces; suggestions to use brownfield sites for development as an alternative to affecting green belts; necessitates rethinking urban development in light of climate change and biodiversity loss.

Resource Management and Sustainability (56 respondents, 40%): Emphasis on sustainable resource management, citing the allotments' role in preserving bath stone resources and contributing to ecosystem services; advocates for sustainable land use policies incorporating environmental stewardship with heritage conservation.

Health and Wellbeing Implications (27 respondents, 19%): Acknowledgement of the mental and physical health benefits provided by local green spaces; viewed as essential for community well-being, physical activity, and social inclusivity by offering natural settings for rest and community connection.

Heritage and design

Policy HD/EQ: Environmental quality

Policy clarity and guidance (2 respondents, 100%): Clear policy design expectations are vital, with a call for Policy HD/EQ to align with the National Design Guide and relevant NGI design guides for coherent and effective environmental quality standards.

Focus on sustainable and high-quality design (2 respondents, 100%): Strong support for creating sustainable, high-quality buildings and places, asserting that good design is key to sustainable development and that proper guidelines can help achieve environmental quality without major policy changes.

Stakeholder engagement in policy development (1 respondent, 50%): Emphasises the importance of collaboration among policymakers, designers, developers, and the community for the successful implementation of Policy HD/EQ to ensure high-quality, sustainable development.

Policy HD/WHSS: World heritage site and its setting

Development Guidance and Policy Enhancement (4 respondents, 100%): Opinions highlight the need for creating and updating policies and planning documents to guide development near WHS, aligning with preservation standards and enhancing the site.

Support for Policy Updates and Amendments (3 respondents, 75%): Stakeholders back revising policies like HD/WHSS to reflect modern conservation needs and development pressures.

Balancing Development with Heritage Conservation (2 respondents, 50%): General consensus on allowing developments that contribute to WHS character and appeal while stressing the need for controlled growth and regulations, particularly building heights, to maintain harmony with heritage.

Heritage Impact Assessments (HIA) Necessity (1 respondent, 25%): Strong agreement on the need for HIAs to safeguard WHS Outstanding Universal Value from developmental impact, promoting responsible development.

Site-specific Development Considerations (1 respondent, 25%): Opinions call for assessing development proposals based on their unique impact on WHS settings, advocating a tailored approach.

Comprehensive Monitoring to Prevent Cumulative Harm (1 respondent, 25%): Views emphasise systematic monitoring to prevent incremental deterioration of heritage values through ongoing oversight and assessment.

Policy HD/HE: Historic environment

Policy Framework and Strategic Guidance Integration (3 respondents, 50%): Highlights the need for better integration of historic environment policies with broader policy frameworks, including international, national, and local guidance, to ensure comprehensive policy coherence; acknowledges the potential increased complexity and compliance burden.

Impact Assessment and Management Planning (2 respondents, 33%): Suggests the necessity of updated and thorough impact assessments and management plans for Heritage Sites, calling for strategic planning in conservation; recognises the resource and expertise demands this may place on authorities.

Preservation vs. Modification Dilemmas (2 respondents, 33%): Discusses the challenge of balancing heritage asset preservation with contemporary needs like energy efficiency, noting the tension between existing regulations and the need for adaptability.

Heritage Assets as Catalysts for Public Benefit (1 respondent, 17%): Points to opportunities for policies to balance development impacts with potential public benefits, arguing for more support in policy for projects that enhance community gains while preserving heritage.

Bureaucratic and Cost Impediments (1 respondent, 17%): Comments on the bureaucracy and costs involved in altering heritage assets, such as the need for detailed plans and challenging local authority practices, which can discourage maintenance and improvements.

Urban Ecology and Character Preservation (1 respondent, 17%): Raises concerns about the loss of urban green spaces and character due to hard surfacing for parking, underlining their importance for biodiversity and historic area character; calls for policies accommodating both practical needs and conservation goals.

Policy HD/SCCW: Somersetshire Coal Canal and the Wansdyke

Policy HD/SCCW Revitalisation Support vs. Opposition (56 respondents, 95%): Divided opinions on policy amendments for canal restoration, with support for public benefit and opposition citing negative impacts on residential land and livelihood.

Potential for Canal as Community Asset vs. Risk to Personal Enjoyment and Property (46 respondents, 78%): Balance sought between the canal as a community asset for leisure and connectivity, and the protection of individuals' property rights.

Preservation of Heritage vs. Modern Development Concerns (32 respondents, 54%): Preservation of the canal's historical significance is valued, yet concerns exist over potential loss of land and negative impacts on local heritage from modern developments.

Economic and Community Benefits vs. Property and Environmental Concerns (32 respondents, 54%): Restoration seen as bringing economic and social benefits, with concerns about adverse environmental effects and property values.

Recreational Use and Access vs. Loss of Privacy and Tranquility (23 respondents, 39%): Advocacy for recreational paths contrasts with concerns over privacy and tranquillity for residents near the canal.

Nature Conservation and Biodiversity vs. Construction and Expansion Drawbacks (2 respondents, 3%): Project seen as an opportunity for wildlife and biodiversity, though there are reservations about the impacts of construction.

Public Engagement and Communication vs. Perceived Exclusivity (1 respondent, 2%): Need for inclusive decision-making emphasized, with concerns over lack of proper community consultation and notification of plans.

Policy HD/GUDP: General urban design principles

Community Involvement in Urban Design Policy Making (1 respondent, 50%): Community input is seen as essential for developing urban design policies that reflect local desires and the specific character of an area.

Integration of Nature and Biodiversity in Urban Design (1 respondent, 50%): Critics suggest updating urban design principles to incorporate natural elements and biodiversity to align with the national design guide, enhancing ecosystems and resident well-being.

Policy HD/LCD: Local character and distinctiveness

Architectural Harmony and Landscape Integration (2 respondents, 67%): New developments should respect local architectural styles and landscapes, maintaining visual cohesiveness and the unique aesthetic of the area while also accommodating evolving demands.

Privacy and Residential Amenity Protection (1 respondent, 33%): Development policies need to consider the impact on residents' privacy, suggesting that thoughtful design can help balance development needs with the protection of residential amenity.

Policy Compatibility and Community Support (1 respondent, 33%): The success of the HD/LCD policy is tied to its resonance with local values, requiring it to reflect community aspirations to gain their support and effectiveness.

Ecological Consideration and Enhancement (1 respondent, 33%): Incorporating ecological networks and enhancing natural habitats should be part of the development process, promoting a balanced approach that can boost local biodiversity while meeting development goals.

Policy HD/SS: Streets and spaces

Enhancement of urban greenery (2 respondents, 100%): Respondents mentioned significant support for more robust street tree policies, recognizing the essential role of trees in providing shade and enhancing urban spaces. Issues of maintenance and infrastructure compatibility were acknowledged in discussions on increasing urban greenery.

Policy HD/BD: Building design

Environmental Integration in Building Design (2 respondents, 67%): Support expressed for incorporating habitat features in building designs to balance innovative architecture with conservation, notably including bird nesting sites and hedgehog-friendly measures.

Commitment to High Design Standards (1 respondent, 33%): Consensus on the need for high-quality, innovative design standards in building projects, emphasising improved urban aesthetics and living at the site off Claude Avenue.

Policy HD/A: Amenity

Protection of cultural venues under policy HD/A: Amenity (1 respondent, 50%): Respondents mentioned the policy's role in safeguarding small cultural venues, particularly from the challenges posed by new residential developments that might result in noise complaints and closures.

Enhancement of privacy regulations (1 respondent, 50%): Some raised the need for more robust privacy measures within the policy to prevent overlooking and protect residents' privacy from new developments, suggesting more specific planning guidelines.

Policy HD/IBD: Infill and backland development

Rural character preservation vs development needs (1 respondent, 50%): Development in rural areas should reflect existing housing densities to maintain green spaces and the local rural character, despite the challenge of balancing these values against housing needs, as seen in developments like Richmont Place, Silvertrees, and Water St Close in East Harptree.

Architectural integration and privacy (1 respondent, 50%): New developments should take into account ridge heights and the overall height relative to neighbouring properties to ensure architectural harmony and respect the landscape silhouette. Policy should protect against overlooking, maintaining privacy and residents' enjoyment of their property.

Policy HD/L: Lighting

Community Engagement and Designation (8 respondents, 80%): Structured community involvement is favoured for decision-making on environmental zones and dark skies areas to customise local lighting solutions.

Cultural and Aesthetic Values (7 respondents, 70%): Preserving the night sky and historical vistas against light pollution is a priority, with a focus on balancing protection with lighting needs.

Wildlife Conservation and Biodiversity (6 respondents, 60%): The detrimental effects of artificial blue light on wildlife behaviour and ecosystems are highlighted, with calls for minimising light pollution while supporting human activities.

Innovative Solutions and Best Practices (3 respondents, 30%): Adoption of green infrastructure and flexible lighting solutions is encouraged, alongside learning from successful lighting management models.

Health and Well-being Impacts (3 respondents, 30%): Negative effects of blue and cool white light on sleep and well-being are noted, advocating for blue-light-free zones and specific colour temperature regulations.

Regulatory Compliance and Enforcement (3 respondents, 30%): A need for clearer lighting policy guidelines and stricter enforcement to bridge the gap between policy intentions and actual implementation is identified.

Policy HD/AOSF: Advertisements and outdoor street furniture

Impact on Urban Aesthetics (1 respondent, 100%): Respondents mentioned that the implementation of well-designed advertisements and outdoor street furniture is vital for enhancing urban aesthetics and maintaining high standards in public spaces. Conversely, neglect or poor execution could lead to a decline in the visual quality of urban environments, reflecting the "broken windows theory" where initial neglect can cause a cycle of degradation.

Policy HD/DC: Design codes

National vs. Local Design Codes (9 respondents, 82%): Local design codes should reflect local criteria, adapting national policies to the specifics of the community, thereby supporting grassroots planning approaches.

Avoidance of Generic Design (7 respondents, 64%): Concerns centre on preventing uninspired building designs, encouraging unique and characterful designs that contribute to the local area's distinctiveness.

Local Character and Architectural Heritage Preservation (6 respondents, 55%): There's a preference for design codes that ensure new developments harmonise with and enhance local character and architectural heritage, whilst also encouraging modern innovation.

Community Engagement and Master Planning (1 respondent, 9%): Design codes are viewed as a vehicle for improving master planning and community engagement in large developments, balancing local input with practical development needs.

Encouragement of Sustainability and Biodiversity (1 respondent, 9%): There is advocacy for design codes that mandate energy efficiency, reduced carbon emissions, and biodiversity protection, without hampering innovation.

Sustainable transport

Policy ST/HS: Promoting sustainable travel and healthy streets

Policy Precision and Clarity (19 respondents, 83%): Demand for clearer definitions within the policy, particularly around realistic travel options, the concept of short journeys, and sustainable transport modes.

Integration with Existing Transport Plans (14 respondents, 61%): Challenges in aligning new development plans with the current local transport plan, highlighting the need for integrated, coordinated planning.

Influence on Behavioural Change (13 respondents, 57%): The policy's role in encouraging a shift from cars to more sustainable modes, while considering the practicality and affordability of alternatives.

Equitable Access and Inclusivity (9 respondents, 39%): Equity and accessibility concerns in urban planning, suggesting the need for adaptable policies that cater to various community needs.

Infrastructure and Private Car Use (8 respondents, 35%): Acknowledgement of the ongoing role of private cars with a call for improved infrastructure that supports sustainability.

Environmental and Social Co-benefits (4 respondents, 17%): Advocacy for the policy to foster nature recovery, green infrastructure, and sociable spaces for a holistic urban environment.

Evidence Base and Monitoring (1 respondent, 4%): The necessity for a robust evidence base and uncertainty logging to underpin the policy and measure its success over time.

Policy ST/AT: Active travel routes

Strategic Planning and Policy Alignment (14 respondents, 78%): Calls for a holistic approach to integrate the active travel masterplan with other policies including local plans and transport strategies, ensuring alignment with sustainable development goals.

Integration with Other Transport Modes (12 respondents, 67%): Discusses the need for active travel routes to cohesively integrate with other transport forms, stressing on detailed evaluations for a sustainable, reduced-car-reliance transport system.

Protection and Enhancement of Active Travel Routes (11 respondents, 61%): Advocates for the protection of active travel routes against development pressures and enhancement by connecting key destinations, with necessary cost-benefit analyses.

Carbon Emission Reduction Prioritization (6 respondents, 33%): Places emphasis on prioritising transport modes that significantly cut down carbon emissions within the active travel strategy to support climate change mitigation efforts.

Public and Stakeholder Engagement (5 respondents, 28%): Highlights the importance of consulting the community and stakeholders to create an inclusive active travel masterplan that resonates with public and stakeholder expectations.

Challenges and Controversies (2 respondents, 11%): Addresses the diverse opinions on active travel, including concerns about impact on car users and behavior change towards walking or cycling, stressing the need for a balanced approach.

Accessibility and Inclusivity (1 respondent, 6%): Underlines the necessity for active travel routes to be universally accessible to all individuals, ensuring inclusivity across the demographic spectrum.

Policy ST/RMD: Transport requirements for managing development

Decide and Provide Approach (12 respondents, 75%): Respondents show support for the 'decide and provide' approach for its clear guidelines and potential to address actual transport needs alongside contributing to the climate emergency; however, concerns exist about the adequacy of evidence-based planning tools.

Policy Clarity and Consistency (9 respondents, 56%): Feedback indicates a need for clearer policy terminology and methodologies to avoid confusion and ensure a consistent approach across the 'decide and provide' model's implementation.

Sustainable Travel Integration (6 respondents, 38%): Support for the inclusion of sustainable travel options like public transport and cycling in early development stages is noted, with concerns about the challenges in rural areas and during winter conditions.

Proactive versus Promotive Approach to Sustainable Travel (5 respondents, 31%): A shift is suggested from merely promoting to enabling sustainable travel, proposing developments be designed to make sustainable options the most attractive choice.

Transport Planning and Development Impact (5 respondents, 31%): There's emphasis on integrating transport and land use planning, taking a proportionate approach to the scale of development, and improving the accuracy of traffic impact assessments.

Evidence-based Decision Making (1 respondent, 6%): The concern raised focuses on the need for developing or updating models like microsimulation traffic models to support informed planning and provide accurate, reliable data for policy decisions.

Pollution, contamination and safety

Policy PCS/NV: Noise and vibration

Residential amenity and mental wellbeing (4 respondents, 80%): Noise and vibration impacts are linked to reduced quality of life, with suggestions for robust policy measures to address mental wellbeing and sleep disruptions.

Balancing interests between new and existing developments (4 respondents, 80%): Tensions between the preservation of existing occupants' interests, including those in heritage properties and musical venues, and the facilitation of new developments necessitate policies for equitable coexistence.

Policy implementation and enforcement (2 respondents, 40%): Criticism of a shift towards self-regulation and the need for clearer enforcement principles to close the gap between policy intent and actual outcomes.

Support for cultural and creative activities (1 respondent, 20%): Advocacy for a regulatory framework that acknowledges the value of creative practices, arguing for noise regulation that allows cultural activities to thrive alongside residential tranquillity.

Heritage building protection versus development needs (1 respondent, 20%): The debate over stringent measures to protect heritage buildings' tranquillity versus the acceptance of necessary and harmoniously integrated development.

Policy PCS/AQ: Air quality

Accessibility and clarity of policy information (1 respondent, 50%): Respondents mentioned difficulties in accessing and understanding 'Policy PCS/AQ: Air Quality' documents, suggesting a need for more transparent and user-friendly information to improve public engagement and compliance.

Impact of vehicle size on emissions and urban space (1 respondent, 50%): Some raised concerns over emissions from larger vehicles, including electric ones, in urban areas like Bath, indicating a need for a nuanced policy that encourages the use of smaller vehicles to benefit air quality and reduce congestion.

Policy PCS/BHS: Bath hot springs

Environmental Impacts of PCS/BHS Policy (1 respondent, 100%): The policy for Bath Hot Springs is acknowledged for its potential to reduce environmental pollution, leading to cleaner air and water. Concerns are raised about possible ecological disturbances due to increased human activity and the need for infrastructure development. The balance of environmental pros against potential cons is noted as vital.

Minerals and waste

Policy MIN/M: Strategic approach to minerals

Policy Planning and Implementation (3 respondents, 75%): Criticisms highlight issues with the accuracy of maps delineating mineral safeguarding areas, emphasizing the need for precise and current mapping to prevent mismanagement of both mineral resources and green spaces.

Land Use and Resource Management (3 respondents, 75%): Respondents point out the conflict between designating land for mineral extraction and using it for housing or allotments, underscoring the challenge of balancing economic activities and community values.

Local Community and Green Spaces (2 respondents, 50%): Support is shown for protecting community resources like the allotments at Combe Down as local green spaces, emphasizing the value placed on maintaining these areas amidst mineral extraction interests.

Biodiversity and Habitat Connectivity (1 respondent, 25%): Interest is expressed in enhancing biodiversity and habitat connectivity through the strategic management of mineral extraction sites.

Environmental Enhancement and Restoration (1 respondent, 25%): Support is noted for initiatives aimed at mitigating the ecological impacts of mineral extraction and improving biodiversity and public access to nature through restoration efforts.

Policy MIN/MD: Minerals development: environmental enhancement through restoration

Biodiversity vs. Recreational Use (1 respondent, 100%): The potential conflict between prioritising biodiversity net gain and the use of sites for recreation and leisure is examined, with an emphasis on finding a balance between conserving ecology and promoting public enjoyment.

Policy MIN/HC: Conventional and unconventional hydrocarbons

Environmental Protection and Climate Action (4 respondents, 100%): Views emphasise preserving natural resources and aligning with climate emergency goals. Advocates favour sustainable energy over hydrocarbon extraction to protect biodiversity and landscapes.

Legislation and Local Authority Empowerment (2 respondents, 50%): Calls for stronger legislation and increased local authority powers, reflecting desire for more control over local environment and more effective means to combat climate change.

Waste

Collaboration and Efficiency in Waste Management (1 respondent, 100%): Notes collaboration is best for efficiency in waste management.

Infrastructure

Planning and Viability of Infrastructure Development (7 respondents, 100%): Respondents desire clear, strategic planning and express concerns over financial viability potentially affecting infrastructure provision and quality.

Funding and Resource Allocation for Infrastructure (4 respondents, 57%): Calls for sufficient funding for infrastructure.   Highlights the challenge of matching resource allocation with infrastructure demands without compromising service levels.

Healthcare Infrastructure and Delivery (3 respondents, 43%): The need for planned, innovative healthcare infrastructure that is timely and integrated with overall development is emphasised.

Local Government Policy and Stakeholder Engagement (1 respondent, 14%): The alignment of local policies with national health policies and effective stakeholder engagement is encouraged.

Sustainability and Environmental Impact of Infrastructure (1 respondent, 14%): Sustainable development practices and the challenge of retrofitting buildings for environmental standards are important to respondents.

Energy Efficiency and Housing Policy (1 respondent, 14%): High sustainability standards for housing developments and refurbishments are called for, recognising financial and practical challenges.