

**TABLE 1: RESPONSE SUMMARY**

No	SOURCE	VIEW(S)	RESPONSE	COMMENT
1	WAG (written comments post meeting of 4 January 2013)	In principle would not wish to see any development of the field and for it to remain as open space although it seems clear that some form of development will be acceptable.	Noted	
2		The planning permission for the Ridgeway Court houses (1983 2168P/83N) contains an Informative that states that no further development will be allowed off the access.	Noted but there was debate as to whether this is "enforceable" in current circumstances.	NDL planning consultant advised that this was an Informative on an historical permission that would not be likely to be a significant consideration in current circumstances.
3		Why couldn't the main Henbury Hill access be used to serve the development?	Noted	NDL planning consultant advised that there was a theoretical limit of the traffic likely to be acceptable through this junction based on established historical use. <b>NB: this land / access has now been sold in any event</b>

No	SOURCE	VIEW(S)	RESPONSE	COMMENT
4		Could fewer larger houses be built?	Yes but the layout/number of houses is a product of site/context assessment.	NB: there has been some pressure to increase the number of houses/density but this has been resisted on the basis of design response and residential amenity grounds.
5		Is any affordable housing proposed?	No	
6		What buffer planting is proposed?	Plans would be reviewed to elaborate on this specific point.	
7		Concern expressed re orientation and overlooking	Plans would be reviewed to elaborate on this specific point.	
8		Strongly oppose any "link" between Ridgeway Court and the rest of the site and College Park Drive/Blaise Castle open space or from the rest of the site, including residents of Frances Greeves House direct to Ridgeway Court.	Noted.	This has been a theme/view at a number of the events. No link is therefore proposed.

No	SOURCE	VIEW(S)	RESPONSE	COMMENT
9	BS10 Group (meeting 7 January 2013)	Suggested direct contact with Henbury and Brentry Conservation Group.	Contact made but Conservation Group advised that a specific meeting was considered unnecessary.	
10		Suggest "public meeting" and publicity via circulating newsletters/webs sites.	Noted and arranged via WoT Society.	
11		No significant objections. Don't want "through traffic" / woodland to stay "private" and managed with perhaps permissive access.	Noted. No link is proposed. Further thought would be given to woodland management and permissive access.	
12		Query safety of Passage Road access.	Noted.	NDL Transport consultants have looked at this junction and consider it adequate to take the likely increase in traffic movements. BCC officers have also confirmed this.

<b>No</b>	<b>SOURCE</b>	<b>VIEW(S)</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>
13	WOT Society (meeting and site visit 7 January 2013)	No real objections to emerging plans but would like maintenance and some access to retained woodland.	Further thought would be given to woodland management and permissive access.	
14	Email from BCC Urban Design Officer dated 3 January 2013	Care Home use acceptable. General design comments made in relation to preliminary plans submitted.	Noted and details passed to Cedar Care Homes Ltd.	Comments relate to the proposed preliminary Care Home extension only, which is not part of this application.
15	BCC Conservation Advisory Panel (15 January 2013)	Loss of "playing field" needs further consideration.	Noted	There was no consensus position arising from the comments of the CAP members. The loss of "open space" point is directly addressed in a separate technical report prepared by Sports Solutions.
16		Main Building and woodland are important elements in the landscape/long views.	Noted	See Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment.
17		Woodland must be preserved and maintained.	Noted	The woodland is to be retained and positively maintained.

No	SOURCE	VIEW(S)	RESPONSE	COMMENT
18		Linking the access roads would not be supported.	Noted	See point 11 above.
19		The development should make more efficient use of the land.	Noted but not accepted. While making efficient use of urban land is a general aim the site is a Conservation Area and the character of the immediate area is "low density" and "loose knit".	Local residents are also very much against higher density development primarily because of residential amenity concerns related to traffic movements.
20		Setting of houses must relate to woodland and not dominate the landscape.	Noted and carefully reconsidered as part of layout revisions.	
21	BCC Planning Officer (email dated 17 January 2013)	Site is allocated as Important Open Space in emerging Site Allocations SPD but assume representations will be submitted. Onus is on the applicant to demonstrate that site is not valuable in terms of amenity, recreation or ecology.	Noted	NDL have submitted representations to the Site Allocations DPD. Supporting reports address amenity, recreation, landscape and ecology issues.

No	SOURCE	VIEW(S)	RESPONSE	COMMENT
22		Potentially too few houses are proposed.	Noted but the design response is considered having regard to grain of adjoining development within which the site will be seen.	
23		Detailed issues need to be addressed.	Noted	
24	Henbury Community Council presentation and Q&A (17 January 2013)	No in principle objections but some questions asked. Is any of the site proposed to be in community use?	NDL advised that none of the site is currently proposed to be in community use.	NB: the Main and Headingly Buildings were subsequently sold to Cedar Care Homes Ltd and it is understood that the Main Building will be reused as a Care Home.
25		Will the woodland be open to the public or will permissive access be proposed?	NDL advised that no public access was proposed but permissive access would be considered.	
26		Will there be a link between Ridgway Court through the site?	No	

No	SOURCE	VIEW(S)	RESPONSE	COMMENT
27		Would new home owners have access to the woodland?	Not sure. Final plans in respect of this are yet to be formulated.	
28	Public meeting (28 January 2013)	Concern and questions re level of parking proposed.	The level of parking proposed is consistent with BCC standards.	Only comments are reported here. The Q&As are contained in the note at <b>Appendix 6</b> .
29		No support for a through road.	Noted	
30		Demolition of the Main Building would be a mistake.	Noted and not proposed via initial "preferred" option but Main Building now sold.	
31		Traffic issues at Henbury Hill and Passage Road junction. Further assessment is required.	Noted	Reassessed and discussed in the Transport Statement submitted alongside the application.
32		When The Ridgeway was built a planning condition was imposed to prevent further development off the road.	This is a reference to an Informative imposed on the 1983 planning permission for Ridgeway Court.	See response to No. 2 above

No	SOURCE	VIEW(S)	RESPONSE	COMMENT
33		Immediately adjoining residential amenity could be compromised if there is no control on the maintenance / protection of trees.	Noted	A detailed landscaping scheme and subsequent maintenance regime will be agreed with BCC.
34		There are badgers, bats and owls on site. The woodland and trees need to be managed and maintained and no trees should be removed.	Noted. Approximately 15 trees are proposed to be removed.	Detailed ecological and arboricultural assessments have been undertaken. Mitigation and enhancement proposals will be included in the application and/or agreed with BCC, including significant new tree and shrub planting.
35		Good plan but some concern about emergency vehicle access.	Noted. The emergency/service vehicle access turning area has been amended to ensure it meets current standards and is adequate/fit for purpose.	



No	SOURCE	VIEW(S)	RESPONSE	COMMENT
36		Site could remain a building site for 10 years.	This is not correct. It is anticipated that the development would be completed within 1 year of a start on site.	
37	BS10 Group update (8 April 2013)	No objections in principle and no further comments.	Noted	
38	WAG (email dated 25 March 2013)	Concern at through link. What will prevent this?	A physical barrier comprising landscaping and a fence will prevent any through access. As above no link between Ridgeway Court and College Park Drive will be proposed.	
39		What will the "buffer zones" comprise and who will maintain these?	Detailed landscaping proposals will be worked up.	At the present time NDL do not know who will take responsibility for maintenance. However, it will be maintained and BCC are likely to require this via planning condition.

No	SOURCE	VIEW(S)	RESPONSE	COMMENT
40		The turning head looks too small.	Noted and revised.	
41		Who will manage construction and prevent parking of contractors vehicle on Ridgeway Court/The Ridgeway.	It is proposed that a Construction Environment Management Plan will be prepared, submitted and approved by BCC. This will likely control parking on residential streets and cover issues such as working hours and pollution control.	
42	Local resident (email dated 27 March 2013)	Development looks attractive		
43	Wesley SOS Group (residents of Northover Road) – letter direct to BCC.	The loss of the green space will need to be justified.	Noted and addressed in a number of the supporting reports including the DAS and the Open Space Review report.	

No	SOURCE	VIEW(S)	RESPONSE	COMMENT
44		Layout is generic and unoriginal and not good design.	Noted but not accepted	
45		House designs are of poor quality, uninteresting and bland. An exceptional scheme is required.	Noted but not accepted. However some minor changes have been made to materials and external appearance partly in response	
46		Specific reports need to address detailed issues including highway safety/access; ecology; heritage; residential amenity; surface water drainage; sustainability and management of construction.	All of the detailed matters referred to are either dealt with in specific supporting reports or are proposed to be dealt with via subsequently submitted details e.g. woodland and construction management.	

No	SOURCE	VIEW(S)	RESPONSE	COMMENT
47		Consultation so far has been very limited and piecemeal.	This is strongly refuted. Pre-application engagement has been tailored to the specific requirements of key local groups and broadly supported.	NDL were unaware of the Wesley SOS Group until receipt of this letter and are still unaware of how many people are in this group. The writer of the letter attended the meeting on the 22 April 2013 – see below
48	WAG/Wesley SOS Group meeting (22 April 2013)	What detail is proposed between junction of Ridgeway Court and the site access road? Concern at traffic speeds at this point.	NDL agreed to consider this and provide details/detail in the planning application.	
49		Concern at on-street parking from contractors vehicles.	Noted	See point 41 above.
50		What will prevent movement between Ridgeway Court, Frances Greeves House and/or College Park Drive?	Noted	See point 38 above.
51		Would prefer low level lighting.	Noted and will be proposed in the planning application.	

No	SOURCE	VIEW(S)	RESPONSE	COMMENT
52		What landscaping is proposed and who will maintain buffer planting?	Noted	See point 39 above.
53				NB: the representative of the Wesley SOS Group raised similar points/opinions to those specifically referred to at points 43-47 above including specifically design and sustainability.
54	Local resident of Northover Road (email April 2013)	Existing quiet and attractive environment behind existing house will be adversely affected. How will this pleasant, private and quiet amenity be maintained?	Existing trees and southern boundary (part covered by TPO) are proposed to be retained and enhanced.	NDL considers that the existing residential environment of properties in Northover Road will not be adversely affected.
55		Northover Road properties have living space at first floor that will be overlooked.	There will be no close or direct window to window overlooking between proposed and existing dwellings.	

No	SOURCE	VIEW(S)	RESPONSE	COMMENT
56	BCC Development Team comments (received via email dated 1 May 2013)	The application should be accompanied by ground condition and land contamination issues. The ground could be "made up" and polluted	The application will be accompanied by a geo-environmental report.	The land is not "made up" or contaminated.
57		A 20m buffer is required to any badger sett.	The development is well outside any 20m buffer zone.	The Badger sett referred to is on land to the rear of the Main Wesley College building and not on the application site.
58		The ecological interest of the woodland SNCI needs to be protected and a 5m buffer is required. A management plan will be required	A 5m buffer is provided for. A management plan will be prepared, submitted and approved in response to any imposed planning condition	

No	SOURCE	VIEW(S)	RESPONSE	COMMENT
59		A bat survey is required and lighting should take account of any bat interest. Ecological enhancement are recommended	An ecological report based on surveys is included as a supporting document. Ecological enhancements can be secured via the management plan referred to above.	
60		A Construction Environment Management Plan is required. BCC may support soakways if designed adequately. Paving within the site should be permeable	Noted	See point 41 above.
61		There are no concerns re air quality	An FRA/Drainage Strategy report accompanies the application.	The FRA/Drainage Strategy is based on soakaway testing and ground condition investigations.
62		A road connection to the east is preferable to one to the west. There are no highway objections. There should be no more than 2 parking spaces per dwelling.	Noted	

No	SOURCE	VIEW(S)	RESPONSE	COMMENT
63		The loss of open space and the impact of development on the character of the area need to be carefully assessed.	Noted. A Sports Review report is included with the application.	
64		Can views to the folly be opened up?	No but this is because the folly is "off-site" and contained in its own private and wooded setting and generally because it can't be seen / is not readily discernible in any public view now.	
65		A high quality development is required. At the moment a standard cul-de-sac is proposed. Concern at layout and dominance of road. Development not well integrated with green infrastructure. Code level 4 is required.	Noted. See the DAS / Sustainability Appraisal for a formal response to these points.	



No	SOURCE	VIEW(S)	RESPONSE	COMMENT
66		Walking and cycling access through the site should be proposed.	This has been considered but will not be proposed as the view is directly contrary to the views of the vast majority of those consulted including specifically local residents and local Councillors.	
67		There may be opportunities for a linked biomass/central heating system with the care home.	Noted but the Main Building is no longer within the ownership control of NDL.	