

## South Gloucestershire Local Plan November 2020

### **Phase 1: Issues and Approaches Consultation Response Form**

Please be aware that anonymous forms cannot be included and that in order for you to submit your form you **must** include your details below.

The information collected as part of this consultation will also be used by the council in accordance with the data protection principles in the Data Protection Act 1998. The purposes for collecting this data is: to assist in plan making; and to contact you, if necessary, regarding the planning consultation process. Some of the data may be made public as it will form part of the evidence base used to inform the creation of planning policy documents. The above purposes may require public disclosure of any data received on the response form, in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The purpose for holding your personal information is to assist in preparing development plan documents and supporting supplementary planning guidance and advice; and to contact you, if necessary, regarding the planning consultation process relating to their preparation. In order to provide the above service we may share your information with the following:

- Other South Gloucestershire Council departments
- External consultants working on behalf of South Gloucestershire Council
- Other Local Planning Authorities (LPAs)
- Other groups preparing statutory development plans relevant to South Gloucestershire

Please follow the link to our [Privacy Policy](#) and [Data Protection Policy](#) to find out more.

## **PART ONE - YOUR DETAILS**

In circumstances where there are individuals / groups / organisations who share a similar view as to how the plan should evolve, it would be helpful if they make a single response. It would also be useful to state how many people the submission is representing and how the comment was authorised.

| <b>Your Details</b>                       | <b>Your Agent's Details (If applicable)</b>                              |
|---|--|
| Reference No (if known*):                 | Reference No (if known*):  |
| Title: Mr / Mrs / Miss / Ms / Dr / Other: | Title: Ms  |
| Surname:                                  | Surname: Green   |
| Forename:                                 | Forename: Sue  |
| Organisation / Company:                   | Organisation / Company: Home Builders Federation (HBF)                   |
| Address:                                  | Address:<br>c/o 80 Needlers End Lane,<br>Balsall Common,<br>Warwickshire |
| Postcode:                                 | Postcode: CV7 7AB  |
| Contact No:                               | Contact No: 07817 865534   |
| Email:                                    | Email: sue.green@hbf.co.uk   |

\*If you have been contacted by post, you will find your reference number at the top of the letter under 'Our Ref'

## **PART TWO – QUESTIONNAIRE COMMENTS**

To view the Phase 1 Issues and Approaches document including the sections referred to in this questionnaire, please visit [www.southglos.gov.uk/LocalPlan2020](http://www.southglos.gov.uk/LocalPlan2020).

### **Question 1: Understanding who is responding**

Please help us understand the type of groups and people that are responding and engaging with the preparation of our new Local Plan, by choosing which one of the following stakeholder groups you best represent.

You must provide an answer to this question.

**Please only select one option from the list:**

- Member of the public
- Business or Company
- Community Group
- Developer, land agent or site promoter
- Registered charity
- Local Councillor
- Neighbourhood Planning Group
- Statutory Body (Environment Agency, Highways Agency, Heritage England, Natural England etc.)
- Town and Parish Council or Clerk
- Utility Company or Infrastructure Provider (Bristol Water, Wessex Water etc.)
- X Other (please state below):

If other, please state: Trade Organisation

---

### **Question 2: Issues**

We have set out 55 issues which our Local Plan will need to consider.

Do you agree that these are the right issues for our plan to consider?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

### **Question 3: Issues**

Would you like to comment on any of the issues or add new issues? Please note the name of the issue in your comments, or tell us what additional issues you think our plan should consider:

The HBF have no comments on the Council's 55 identified key issues, which are divided into 9 themes of Climate Change, Our Environment, Improving Health & Wellbeing, Exceptional Spaces & Places, Planning for Urban & Rural Areas, Planning for New Homes, Our Economy, Travel & Transport and Supporting Infrastructure.

#### Question 4: Priorities

Do you agree with the potential priorities?

- Yes  
 No  
 Don't know

#### Question 5: Priorities

Do you have any comments on the potential priorities?

The HBF have no specific comments on the Council's 9 priorities, which are identified as (1) Pursue a carbon neutral & resilient future in a changing climate, (2) Protect & enhance our environment, (3) Development that promotes health & well-being, (4) Creating exceptional places & spaces, (5) Planning for urban & rural areas, (6) Provide the right type & number of new homes, (7) Enable a productive, clean & inclusive economy, (8) Achieving sustainable travel & transport and (9) Ensuring the timely & efficient provision of infrastructure to support growing communities.

However, the HBF note that since the formal withdrawal of the West of England (WoE) Joint Spatial Plan (JSP), South Gloucestershire Council has committed to working with Bristol City, BANES & North Somerset Councils and the West of England Combined Authority (WECA) on the preparation of a Spatial Development Strategy (SDS) for the period 2020 – 2040. This work has commenced and the SDS is expected to cover strategic planning priorities including a response to climate change emergency declarations, a spatial vision, a spatial strategy on the broad pattern of housing / employment development & infrastructure, housing & jobs requirements and other thematic policies such as affordable housing. It is important that the priorities and plan period (both start and end dates) of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan and SDS are aligned.

#### Question 6: Strategy- Where will development go?

Do you agree with the five building blocks (Urban Areas, Urban Extensions, Market Towns, Rural Villages, New Settlements)?

- Yes  
 No  
 Don't know

#### Question 7: Strategy- Where will development go?

Do you have any comments on the five building blocks (Urban Areas, Urban Extensions, Market Towns, Rural Villages, New Settlements)?

The Council has identified 5 potential Building Blocks for developing its future growth strategy. These building blocks comprise (1) Optimising densities & efficient use of land in existing Urban Areas (Bristol North & East Fringe, Yate and Thornbury), (2) Expansion of Main Urban Areas by small / large urban extensions into locations beyond the communities of the North and East Fringe, (3) Growth beyond the existing settlement boundaries of Market Towns at Yate, Chipping Sodbury and Thornbury, (4) The potential for an appropriate level of sustainable growth in and around the wide range of rural villages and settlements and (5) Large scale free standing new settlements.

The Council's growth strategy should be consistent with the spatial strategy of the WoE SDS and meet the development requirements of the WoE SDS. The Council's growth strategy should also meet the housing needs of South Gloucestershire's urban and rural communities.

There are disadvantages in pursuing any Building Block in isolation.

It is agreed that the Council should make as much use as possible of Previously Developed Land (PDL) in existing urban areas (Building Block (1)) as set out in 2019 NPPF (para 117). However, the Council should avoid "town cramming", which would provide insufficient variety in house typologies to create balanced communities with the right types of new homes to meet the housing needs of different groups. There will be a limited capacity for higher densities and more taller buildings, which will only be appropriate in certain locations. A blanket approach to the intensification of housing densities everywhere would be inappropriate as a range of differing densities will be needed to ensure development is in keeping with the character of the surrounding area. The setting of residential density standards should be undertaken in accordance with the 2019 NPPF (para 123), whereby in the circumstances of an existing or anticipated shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs then a minimum net density in suitable locations such as town centres and those benefiting from good public transport connections may be appropriate. The future deliverability of intensely developed residential schemes will also be dependent on the viability of PDL (see HBF answer to Q18 below) and market demand for high density urban living post Covid-19. Building Block (1) alone is unlikely to meet all development needs due to the restricted capacity of the existing urban area and insufficient availability of brownfield sites. The Council should also consider competing demands from employment and residential uses in the existing urban areas.

Under Building Block (2) if development sites are large scale, there may be long lead in times for the commencement of on-site development and build up to optimum delivery rates. Long lead in times are also associated with large scale free standing new settlements proposed in Building Block (5). Such new settlements should be considered over a longer timeframe (up to 30 years), which is beyond the proposed plan period of the Local Plan and SDS. To ensure a continuous housing land supply (HLS) in the short to medium term, such strategic

sites should be complimented with smaller non-strategic sites at Market Towns and Rural Villages & Settlements.

Building Blocks (3) and (4) will support local communities living in Market Towns and rural villages & settlements. As set out in the 2019 NPPF *“to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services”* (para 78).

In summary, the growth strategy for South Gloucestershire is likely to be a combination of more than one Building Block therefore all Building Blocks should be considered as part of a combination for developing a future growth strategy. The promotion of an effective use of land set out in the 2019 NPPF is not a return to a brownfield first policy approach of the past. The Council’s growth strategy should be a balanced rather than sequential approach. Housing delivery is optimised by the widest possible range of housing site sizes and market locations, which provides suitable land buying opportunities for small, medium and large housebuilding companies. The widest mix of sites provides choice for consumers, allows places to grow in sustainable ways, creates opportunities to diversify the construction sector, responds to changing circumstances, treats the housing requirement as a minimum rather than a maximum and provides competition in the land market. A diversified portfolio of housing sites also offers the widest possible range of products to households to access different types of dwellings to meet their housing needs.

**Question 8: Strategy- Where will development go?**

Do you agree with the initial guiding principles?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

**Question 9: Strategy- Where will development go?**

Do you think we have missed any key, initial guiding principles?

The HBF have no comments on the Council’s 6 potential guiding principles identified as (1) Locate new homes, jobs or settlements in places where key services and facilities are easily accessed or are capable of being provided, (2) Sequential approach to building on areas at a high risk of flooding, (3) Protect & enhance ecological, landscape & heritage designations & their settings, (4) Protect & enhance the connectivity of Green Infrastructure & Nature Recovery Networks, (5) Plan for a better balance between local jobs & resident workers and (6) Protect a “sense of place and character” when planning new development.

**Question 10: Urban Lifestyles**

Do you agree with our Urban Lifestyles approach to investigate further change and growth in our urban areas?

- Yes  
 No  
 Don't know

#### Question 11: Urban Lifestyles

Do you have any comments on the Urban Lifestyle approach to investigate further growth and change in our urban areas?

The Council has identified 6 Lifestyle Themes, which are (1) Optimising density and making efficient use of land, (2) Mixed uses, (3) Private amenity spaces & public realm, (4) Internal living space size (NDSS), (5) Adaptability, views & natural light and (6) Reduced car parking.

The Council is referred to the HBF's answer to Question 7 above on optimising density and making efficient use of land. As set out above, the Council's Urban Lifestyle approach should not revert to an overly ambitious intensification of site densities. It is critical that the Council's approach is robustly evidenced and supported by parties responsible for delivery of housing.

Under Lifestyle Theme (4) if the Council wishes to apply Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) to new build dwellings, then this should only be done in accordance with the 2019 NPPF (para 127f & Footnote 46). Footnote 46 states that "*policies may also make use of the NDSS where the need for an internal space standard can be justified*". As set out in the 2019 NPPF, all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up to date evidence, which should be adequate, proportionate and focussed tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned (para 31). The NPPG sets out that "*where a need for internal space standards is identified, the authority should provide justification for requiring internal space policies. Authorities should take account of the following areas need, viability and timing*" (ID: 56-020-20150327). The Council should provide a robust local assessment evidencing its case (see HBF answer to Q18 below).

With reference to Lifestyle Theme (6), the Council is referred to the HBF's answer to Question 27 below on car parking standards.

#### Question 12: Urban Lifestyles

Do you agree the areas where the Urban Lifestyles approach should be investigated?

- Yes  
 No  
 Don't know

#### Question 13: Urban Lifestyles

Do you have any comments on individual locations we have set out, or other locations which should be investigated for an urban lifestyles approach for further growth and change in our urban areas?

The Council proposes the Urban Lifestyles policy approach for Bristol North Fringe (Cribbs / Mall, former Filton Airfield, Patchway Town Centre, Bradley Stoke Town Centre, Filton Town Centre, Parkway Rail Station to UWE), Bristol East Fringe (Kingswood, Staple Hill, Downend, Emersons Green, Hanham, Longwell Green), Yate and Thornbury.

The Council is referred to the HBF's answers to Questions 7 and 11 above concerning the Council's Urban Lifestyle approach. It is noted that the deliverability of residential development in Bristol North Fringe, Bristol East Fringe, Yate and Thornbury locations will be dependent upon the viability of PDL and the demand for high density urban living post Covid-19 pandemic. It is critical that the Council's Urban Lifestyle approach is supported by parties responsible for delivery of housing in these locations.

#### **Question 14: Creating Sustainable Rural Villages and Settlements**

Do you agree with our proposed approach to the national policy issues highlighted, like flood risk, the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Green Belt, and other planning considerations and issues?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

#### **Question 15: Creating Sustainable Rural Villages and Settlements**

Do you have any comments on our proposed approach to investigate an appropriate level of growth in our rural villages and settlements?

The Council's growth strategy should meet the housing needs of both urban and rural communities. As set out in the 2019 NPPF "*to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services*" (para 78). Unless there are significant constraints or sustainability issues, all rural villages & settlements should be considered for appropriate levels of sustainable growth for homes and jobs.

As set out in 2019 NPPF, where fully evidenced and justified Green Belt boundaries can be altered in "exceptional circumstances" through the preparation or updating of Local Plans (paras 136 & 137). Therefore, the potential for small to medium-scale growth in villages and settlements both in & outside the Green Belt should be investigated.

#### **Question 16: Creating Sustainable Rural Villages and Settlements**



Are there any other planning issues you think we should consider?

The HBF have no further comments on Creating Sustainable Rural Villages & Settlements. The Council is referred to the HBF's answer to Question 15 above.

#### Question 17: Policies

Do you agree with the range and scope of policies we are proposing to include in our new Local Plan?

- Yes  
 No  
 Don't know

#### Question 18: Policies

Do you have any comments on the range and scope of policies we are proposing?

As set out in the 2019 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up to date evidence, which should be adequate, proportionate and focussed tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned (para 31). If the Council is proposing to require optional technical standards, robust evidence to justify such policy requirements should be provided. The Council is referred to the HBF's answer to Question 11 above.

The 2019 NPPF also confirms that Local Plans should avoid unnecessary duplication (para 16f). The Council is referred to the Government's proposed changes to Parts L (Conservation of Fuel & Power), F (Ventilation), M (Access to & Use of Buildings), R (Physical Infrastructure for High-Speed Electronic Communications Networks) & S (Electric Vehicle Charging in Residential & Non-residential Buildings) of the Building Regulations and the Government's proposals for biodiversity gain set out in the Environment Bill. As set out in the Planning for the Future White Paper a simpler planning process improves certainty. The Council is referred to the HBF's answers to Questions 22 and 27 below.

Viability will be a key issue in determining the soundness of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan at Examination. In plan-making, viability is inseparable from the deliverability of development. As set out in the 2019 NPPF, the contributions expected from development including the level & types of affordable housing provision required and other infrastructure for education, health, transport, flood & water management, open space, digital communication, etc. should be set out in the Local Plan (para 34). As stated in the 2019 NPPF, development should not be subject to such a scale of obligations that the deliverability of the Local Plan is threatened (para 34). The viability of individual developments and plan policies should be tested at the plan making stage. Without a robust approach to viability assessment, land will be withheld from the market and housing delivery will be threatened, leading to an unsound Plan and housing delivery targets not being met. Viability assessment should not be conducted on the margins of viability. This will be particularly important in the aftermath of uncertainties caused by the Covid-19 pandemic and Brexit. The Council's updated viability assessment should fully

account for all additional costs associated with proposed policy requirements (see HBF answers to Q7 & Q11 above and Q22 & Q28 below).

**Question 19: Appendix 2: Draft policies:**

**Climate Change and Mitigation**

Do you agree with our proposed policy approach?

- Yes  
 No  
 Don't know

**Question 20: Appendix 2: Draft policies:**

**Climate Change and Mitigation**

Do you think there are any other issues we should consider in this policy?

The South Gloucestershire, Bristol, BANES & North Somerset Councils and the WoE Combined Authority are committed to working together on the preparation of a SDS for the period 2020 – 2040, which is expected to cover strategic planning priorities including a response to climate change emergency declarations. The Council's policy approach to Climate Change & Mitigation should be aligned with the SDS strategy for Climate Change.

The HBF will submit further comments on publication of the Council's Technical Guidance document, which will set out how the policy requirements of the Climate Change Policy can be achieved. It is understood that this Technical Guidance will be prepared to accompany the Local Plan Review.

**Question 21: Appendix 2: Draft policies:**

**Energy Management in New Development**

Do you agree with our proposed policy approach?

- Yes  
 No  
 Don't know

**Question 22: Appendix 2: Draft policies:**

**Energy Management in New Development**

Do you think there are any other issues we should consider in this policy?

The Council's proposed policy approach should not conflict or go beyond the Government's proposals for Building Regulations. As set out in The Future Homes Standard consultation (ended on 7<sup>th</sup> February 2020), the Government intends to future proof new homes with low carbon heating and world-leading levels of energy efficiency by uplifting standards for Part L (Conservation of Fuel & Power) and changing Part F (Ventilation) of the Building Regulations.

Today's new homes are very energy efficient with lower heating bills for residents compared to existing older homes. Energy performance data has shown that around 8 out of 10 new build dwellings have an A or B energy efficiency rating, compared to just 3% of existing properties. An HBF report published in November 2019 found that, as a result, the average new build buyer in England and Wales saves £442.32 every year on heating costs compared to owners of existing dwellings.

The HBF recognise and support the need to move to The Future Homes Standard but there are difficulties and risks to housing delivery given the immaturity of the supply chain for the production / installation of heat pumps and the additional load that would be placed on local electricity networks in combination with Government proposals for the installation of electric vehicle charging points (EVCP) in new homes.

The Government Response to The Future Homes Standard : 2019 Consultation on changes to Part L (conservation of fuel and power) and Part F (ventilation) of the Building Regulations for new dwellings dated January 2021 provides an implementation roadmap, the Government's aim is for the interim Part L (Conservation of fuel and power), Part F (Ventilation) and Overheating Regulations to be regulated for in late 2021 and to come into effect in 2022. The 2021 interim uplift will deliver homes that are expected to produce 31% less CO2 emissions compared to current standards. The second Part L consultation is published alongside the Government's Response. To ensure as many homes as possible are built in line with new energy efficiency standards, transitional arrangements will apply to individual homes rather than an entire development and the transitional period will be one year. This approach will support successful implementation of the 2021 interim uplift and the wider implementation timeline for the Future Homes Standard from 2025.

The Future Homes Standard will ensure that new homes will produce at least 75% lower CO2 emissions than one built to current energy efficiency requirements. Homes built under the Future Homes Standard will be future-proofed with low carbon heating and world-leading levels of energy efficiency. By delivering carbon reductions through the fabric and building services in a home rather than relying on wider carbon offsetting, the Future Homes Standard will ensure new homes have a smaller carbon footprint than any previous Government policy. In addition, this footprint will continue to reduce over time as the electricity grid decarbonises.

The HBF support moving towards greater energy efficiency via a nationally consistent set of standards and timetable, which is universally understood and technically implementable. The Government Response to The Future Homes Standard consultation confirms that the Planning and Energy Act 2008 will not be amended, which means that the Council will retain powers to set local energy efficiency standards for new homes. The HBF acknowledges that the Council may stipulate energy performance standards that exceed the Building Regulations but consider that the Council should comply with the Government's intention of setting standards for energy efficiency through the Building Regulations. It is the HBF's opinion that the Council should not be setting different targets or policies outside of Building Regulations. The key to success is standardisation and avoidance of

individual Council's specifying their own policy approach to energy efficiency, which would undermine economies of scale for product manufacturers, suppliers and developers. As set out in the Planning for the Future White Paper a simpler planning process improves certainty. The higher levels of energy efficiency standards for new homes proposed in the 2021 Part L uplift and Future Homes Standard means that the Council should not need to set local energy efficiency standards in order to achieve the shared net zero goal.

Furthermore, the Council's policy approach should not compromise the viability of development (see HBF answer to Q18 above). The Council's updated viability assessment should include additional costs for 2021 Part L uplift and Future Homes Standard 2025. The Government's estimated cost for Option 2 (interim step of 31% reduction in carbon emissions compared to the current Part L 2013 requirements) is £4,847 per dwelling as yet the full costs for Future Homes Standard 2025 are unknown.

**Question 23: Appendix 2: Draft policies:**

**Renewable and Low Carbon Energy System**

Do you agree with our proposed policy approach?

- Yes  
 No  
 Don't know

**Question 24: Appendix 2: Draft policies:**

**Renewable and Low Carbon Energy System**

Do you think there are any other issues we should consider in this policy?

The HBF have no comments on the Council's draft Renewable & Low Carbon Energy System Policy.

**Question 25: Appendix 2: Draft policies:**

**Creating well-designed places**

Do you agree with our proposed policy approach?

- Yes  
X No  
 Don't know

**Question 26: Appendix 2: Draft policies:**

**Creating well-designed places**

Do you think there are any other issues we should consider in this policy?

The Council is proposing to modify adopted Policies CS1 & PSP1 under Creating well-designed places which is based on characteristics of Context & Identity, Built Form, Movement, Nature & Public Spaces, Uses, Homes & Buildings and Resources & Lifespan.

The Council's policy approach to achieving well designed places should accord with the 2019 NPPF, the latest NPPG, the National Design Guide and National Design Code. Any local guidance should be specific to the locality rather than repetitive of national policy or guidance. It is noted that the draft policy is too prescriptive, overly long and wordy. The Council should re-draft the policy to be more concise and less repetitive.

**Question 27: Appendix 2: Draft policies:**

**Parking requirements**

Do you agree with our proposed policy approach?

- Yes  
 No  
 Don't know

**Question 28: Appendix 2: Draft policies:**

**Parking requirements**

Do you think there are any other issues we should consider in this policy?

The Council is proposing a zonal approach to allow for reduced car parking provision in areas which are demonstrably well connected. All individual dwellings with one or more dedicated parking spaces or garage must include at least one active EVCP with the remainder as passive provision. For residential development with communal off street parking provision, at least 20 per cent of spaces are required to have active charging facilities and passive provision for all remaining spaces.

The Council's Parking Standards Policy should be consistent with 2019 NPPF (paras 105 & 106) and supported by robust evidence justifying its necessity for managing the local road network.

The HBF recognise that electric vehicles will be part of the solution to transitioning to a low carbon future. The Department of Transport consultation on Electric Vehicle Charging in Residential & Non-Residential Buildings (ended on 7<sup>th</sup> October 2019) set out the Government's preferred option to introduce a new requirement for EVCPs under Part S of the Building Regulations. The inclusion of EVCP requirements within the Building Regulations will introduce a standardised consistent approach to EVCPs in new buildings across the country. The Government's proposed requirements will apply to car parking spaces in or adjacent to buildings and the intention is for there to be one charge point per dwelling rather than per parking space (the Government's emphasis underlined). It is proposed that charging points must be at least Mode 3 or equivalent with a minimum power rating output of 7kW fitted with a universal socket to charge all types of electric vehicle currently on the market. It is the HBF's opinion is that the Council's policy approach is unnecessary given the Government's proposals for Part S of the Building Regulations.

If the Council's policy approach is retained, the HBF consider that the physical installation of active EVCPs is unnecessary. The evolution of automotive technology is moving quickly therefore a passive cable and duct approach is a more sensible and future proofed solution, which negates the potential for obsolete technology being experienced by householders. A passive cable and duct approach means that the householder can later arrange and install a physical EVCP suitable for their vehicle and in line with the latest technologies.

The Council's policy approach should not compromise the viability of development (see HBF answer to Q18 above). The cost of EVCPs should be included in the Council's updated viability assessment. The Department for Transport - Electric Vehicle Charging in Residential & Non-Residential Buildings consultation estimated an installation cost of approximately £976 per EVCP. The HBF and its Members also have serious concerns about the capacity of the existing electrical network in the UK. The supply from the power grid is already constrained in many areas across the country. Major network reinforcement will be required across the power network to facilitate the introduction of EVCPs and the move from gas to electric heating as proposed under the Future Homes Standard (also see HBF comments to Question 22 above). These costs can be substantial and can drastically affect the viability of developments. If developers are funding the potential future reinforcement of the National Grid network at significant cost, this will have a significant impact on their businesses and potentially jeopardise future housing delivery. The Government's current proposal automatically levies a capped figure of £3,600 on developers for upgrading local electricity networks, therefore this figure should also be included in the Council's updated viability assessment.

**Question 29: Appendix 2: Draft policies:**

**NSIPs and Related Development**

Do you agree with our proposed policy approach?

- Yes  
 No  
 Don't know

**Question 30: Appendix 2: Draft policies:**

**NSIPs and Related Development**

Do you think there are any other issues we should consider in this policy?

The HBF have no comments on the Council's draft NSIP & Related Development Policy.

**Question 31: Appendix 2: Draft policies:**

**Nuclear New Build**

Do you agree with our proposed policy approach?

- Yes  
 No  
 Don't know

**Question 32: Appendix 2: Draft policies:**

**Nuclear New Build**

Do you think there are any other issues we should consider in this policy?

The HBF have no comment on the Council's draft Nuclear New Build Policy.

**Question 33: Appendix 2: Draft policies:**

**Oldbury A Station – Decommissioning**

Do you agree with our proposed policy approach?

- Yes  
 No  
 Don't know

**Question 34: Appendix 2: Draft policies:**

**Oldbury A Station – Decommissioning**

Do you think there are any other issues we should consider in this policy?

The HBF have no comments on the Council's draft Oldbury A Station – Decommissioning Policy.

**Question 35: Appendix 2: Draft policies:**

**Radioactive Waste**

Do you agree with our proposed policy approach?

- Yes  
 No  
 Don't know

**Question 34: Appendix 2: Draft policies:**

**Radioactive Waste**

Do you think there are any other issues we should consider in this policy?

The HBF have no comment on the Council's draft Radioactive Waste Policy.

Thank you for your participation.

### **PART THREE – RETURNING YOUR COMMENTS**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Please return completed forms by 11:59pm 1 March 2021. Following this date, no further comments will be considered.</b> |   |
| <b>By email:</b>   | <a href="mailto:Policy.consultation@southglos.gov.uk">Policy.consultation@southglos.gov.uk</a>  |
| <b>By post</b>   | Strategic Planning Policy and Specialist Advice Team,<br>South Gloucestershire Council,<br>Environment and Community Services Department,<br>PO Box 1954,<br>Bristol,<br>BS37 ODD |

### **Viewing documents**

The consultation documents are available to view on the Council's website at <http://www.southglos.gov.uk/LocalPlan2020> and online at South Gloucestershire Libraries (please refer to [www.southglos.gov.uk/libraries](http://www.southglos.gov.uk/libraries) for locations and opening times).

Due to Covid-19 and the current national lockdown this consultation will be entirely digital for the early part of December. We will be keeping this situation under close review and will advise if things change.