

Appendix 3 – Response Report Podsmead

Podsmead Comments Received	Key theme	Response	Proposed Change to SPD
Need to capture the culture of the neighbourhoods - ethnographic study	Community	Whilst the council can encourage a resident led process it can not insist on it through the SPD. Any planning applicant will need to demonstrate how they have consulted with the community.	No change required.

<p>We note there are areas being identified for retention that are valued as open space and/or biodiversity as well as new tree planting on Figure 4.2. There are only modest indications of biodiversity enhancement (4.2) although all but the very smallest developments will have to individually consider biodiversity enhancement as the government is proposing this as a mandatory requirement soon. The guidance on green/open spaces for Matson (5.2.9 to 5.2.13) is welcomed but it would be helpful if the 'Building with Nature' accreditation scheme could be referenced somewhere as a good approach. Making reference to the Gloucestershire Local Nature Partnership website would also be helpful to developers and planning officers - www.gloucestershirenature.org.uk .</p> <p>Provision of open green space is part of the solution of being able to allow housing development because it would not generate sufficient recreational pressure on the nearby Cotswold Commons and Beechwoods SAC. This issue is that most housing developments over more than a few houses will need to be subject to a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) process which should be mentioned in Sections 2.4 and 3.6. The interim guidance on this was sent in a letter from Natural England to all relevant Local Planning Authorities in August 2018 which I am sure the City Council is aware of. Along with other planning authorities the City Council should be funding visitor surveys this year which will be used to formulate a recreational strategy for protecting the Cotswold Beechwoods SAC from new residential developments.</p> <p>In paragraph 5.2.6 (and Fig 5.6) we recommend that providing 'good' lighting on routes should not compromise any identified use of these and adjacent area of open space by bats and other sensitive nocturnal wildlife. This can be done by avoiding illumination of hedges, trees, ponds and meadows etc. The use of highly directed lighting on to only the route surface, low level bollards or path inserted lights using LEDs should be considered. These could perhaps be wholly or partially powered by solar energy and be time controlled or triggered to only operate when low light conditions occur.</p>	Environmental quality	Noted. Building with Nature and Policy E8: Development affecting Cotswold Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation are policies in the Presubmission City Plan.	Add reference to Building with Nature accreditation in 'Green Spaces' section 5.2.9 to 12 and reference to Policy E8: Development affecting Cotswold Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation in chapter 3 Planning Policy Context
GCH should concentrate on improving their current stock. I like my flat, I've lived in it for years. I wish they would put right the existing problems rather than knocking buildings down.	Homes	Noted. Comment will be passed on to GCH	No change required.
It would be lovely if they could make improvements to certain parts of the estate.	Community	Noted.	No change required.
I don't understand why GCH want to do it, people are happy in their bungalows, they've lived here for years and it's causing a lot of worry.	Homes	Noted. Comment will be passed on to GCH	No change required.

<p>I don't understand why they are bothering - why can't they just improve what they already have? We (residents on Shakespeare Avenue) always get forgotten about when it comes to improvements. We don't want to move, we like where we live.</p>	<p>Community</p>	<p>Noted. No proposals have been submitted to the council at this time.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>
<p>I like my bungalow and don't want it to change - some cladding on the outside would be nice.</p>	<p>Homes</p>	<p>Noted. No proposals have been submitted to the council at this time.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>
<p>We need more drop curbs in Podsmead.</p>	<p>Access</p>	<p>CP policy C1 - Active design and accessibility will also be considered during any future planning application stage.</p>	<p>Ensure reference to CP policy C1 in Chapter 3 Planning Policy Context</p>
<p>I would like to see an increase in affordable homes. I do believe the homes in Podsmead are already warm but not environmentally friendly.</p>	<p>Homes</p>	<p>A rehousing strategy would be required to be submitted with any planning application. This strategy will provide the council and residents with details of who is affected and what is proposed to ensure that residents have their housing needs met. This is a requirement of SD11, SD12, of the JCS and CP policy A3 and reiterated in the SPD text. Expand 6.2 to refer to Local Needs Assessment for each phase to ensure the housing needs of residents are met.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>

Residents are always leaving the area and going to other communities because podsmead lacks facilities. We needs more youth facilities in Podsmead the area has been neglected for to long and the community is divided.	Shops and Services	Noted.	No change required.
We do not need any 3 story houses. Kingsway has it and it looks a state. We need less flats and more houses. Halford house I feel is a lovely building but would be better if painted a new colour and was refurbished. I am worried where the cafe and big local will be when the buildings are demolished. To enable residents to stay in this community you need to hold more event and provide more facilities as the community is usually divided. We need more sound barriers as cars and mopeds cause so much noise.	Homes	Noted. Proposed housing would have to meet housing need.	No change required.
As GCH say, They will try to rehouse people in 1 move. They will have to build something first and where will it be? I have not seen anything of the plans I have seem.	Homes	Noted. No plans are available at this stage.	No change required.
I love the green and open spaces we have in Podsmead, it would be a shame for them to be built on but if doing so improves the quality of the existing parks and fields then that wouldn't be a bad thing. More activities for children please	Open Space	Noted. Open spaces need to be very carefully managed so as to not set a precedent for developers to build on open spaces. Any proposed development would have to comply with the policies of the NPPF, JCS and CP.	No change required.
They could be improved, the park equipment is a bit tatty.	Open Space	Noted. This is already dealt with in the SPD	No change required.
Put Scott Avenue park in the centre of the green so it's away from the road and closer to the café. I value the green and open spaces and would hate to see them built on. More tree planting would be beneficial for residents and the environment.	Open Space	Noted.	Include tree planting as an opportunity in 2.5
I love how green and peaceful it is here - the open spaces could be better maintained in some parts though	Open Space	Noted.	No change required.
I like that it's green and open here.	Open Space	Noted.	No change required.
I would appreciate it if the parks were more interesting and had things for older teenagers to do.	Open Space	Noted.	No change required.

Crypt school needs a safer crossing as students walk behind busses filter light is needed turning right on to Cole Avenue from Podsmead Road	Highways	Noted. The Highways Authority will be consulted on all planning applications to ensure highway safety.	No change required.
The remembrance garden on Scott Avenue green has been neglected and is massively neglected and used for drugs. The parks in Podsmead are aimed at older generations and the only park for younger children is the one on Wingate field. I believe trees are good for podsmead but trees are too close to houses and they over hang residents gardens making a mess.	Open Space	Noted.	Include tree planting as an opportunity in 2.5
The green spaces and play areas need to be preserved even if they are moved. Lots of trees. Enhanced buffer to A38. The Play area in Matson Avenue needs to be preserved. Better design for more usage.	Open Space	Noted.	Include tree planting as an opportunity in 2.5
More play facilities a skate park is needed and less alley ways. Do not open up bottom of Shakespeare it was cut off for policing issues. As it was used as an escape route.	Open Space	Noted.	No change required.
Don't make it too built up	Homes	Noted.	No change required.
Improved security for older people's homes would be a good thing	Security and crime	Noted.	Include reference to 'Designing Safer Places' SPD.
Better shops with fresh produce and more affordable household items	Shops and Services	Noted. Improving local shops and amenities for residents is one of the aims of the SPD	No change required.
Fish and chips shop would be good	Shops and Services	Noted. Improving local shops and amenities for residents is one of the aims of the SPD	No change required.
Pharmacy with healthcare staff who can provide check-ups	Shops and Services	Noted. Improving local shops and amenities for residents is one of the aims of the SPD	No change required.
Not a fan of town houses	Homes	Noted. Proposed housing would have to meet housing need.	No change required.

Don't want Podsmead to lose its character	Community	Noted. It is important that the character is preserved and enhanced. This is protected by policies in the JCS and CP	No change required.
A co-op shop would be great, better access generally to fresh produce	Shops and Services	Noted. Improving local shops and amenities for residents is one of the aims of the SPD	No change required.
A couple of small independent businesses would be good	Shops and Services	Noted. Improving local shops and amenities for residents is one of the aims of the SPD	No change required.
Don't build three storey houses like Kingsway	Homes	Noted. Proposed housing would have to meet housing need.	No change required.
Don't try to cram too many people in.	Homes	Noted.	No change required.
A pharmacy would be great and better local shops	Shops and Services	Noted. Improving local shops and amenities for residents is one of the aims of the SPD	No change required.
Better facilities - pharmacy with health care advice	Shops and Services	Noted. Improving local shops and amenities for residents is one of the aims of the SPD	No change required.
More shops co-op, fish and chip shop would be good	Shops and Services	Noted. Improving local shops and amenities for residents is one of the aims of the SPD	No change required.
Improve what you already have rather than ripping them down and starting again	Homes	Noted.	No change required.
More shops would be good, we could really do with a pharmacy and youth centre.	Shops and Services	Noted. Improving local shops and amenities for residents is one of the aims of the SPD	No change required.

<p>We need more social housing in Podsmead as it is hugely neglected. Podsmead is looking a state but its not as bad as Matson. There is nothing to attract residents into Podsmead. There isn't anything here we need. Things like a tennis court or a local Podsmead Football team. The Ramblers is in the wrong place. We need CCTV in the area and get rid of the flats they are a nuisance.</p>	<p>Community</p>	<p>Noted. Proposed housing would have to meet housing need.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>
<p>Drs surgery and pharmacy would be a good idea.</p>	<p>Shops and Services</p>	<p>Noted. Improving local shops and amenities for residents is one of the aims of the SPD</p>	<p>No change required.</p>
<p>As a home owner I would need a decent price for my home so I could buy elsewhere.</p>	<p>Homes</p>	<p>At the time of writing no developers have submitted any detailed layout which shows any development proposals. A rehousing strategy would be required to be submitted with any planning application. This strategy will provide the council and residents with details of who is affected and what is proposed to ensure that residents have their housing needs met. This is a requirement of SD11, SD12, of the JCS and CP policy A3 and reiterated in the SPD text.</p>	<p>Add reference to owner occupiers in any descriptions of rehousing strategy</p>

There needs to be garages included in the housing and not parking away from house. A lot of families have at least 2 cars and more if adult children still live at home.	Parking	Noted. Parking is dealt with in the SPD and all planning applications will be sent to the Highways Authority to check they are supportive of the levels of parking and ensure a safe highway.	No change required.
A mix of building styles look better than lots of little boxes.	Homes	Noted. The SPD has a comprehensive design chapter and any application will need to accord with the design policies of the JCS and CP.	No change required.
There needs to be a community centre with no break in. Needs to be a more central multi-functional community centre.	Community	Noted.	Include reference to 'Designing Safer Places' SPD.
We need more high quality designs, no buildings are attractive in Podsmead. Apart from Woodpecker, (not able to read place name), Podsmead Place, (no able to read place name). GCH has really neglected the area. You really need to stand up for your residents and put them first.	Homes	Noted. Comment will be passed onto GCH.	No change required.
Epney Road needs to redesign its hard and very sharp turnings. Milton Avenue needs speed bumps or a speed camera as residents fly up the road at approx. 60 mph. Blackbridge needs a fence to stop motorcycles going over the field.	Highways	Noted. The Highways Authority will be consulted on all planning applications to ensure highway safety.	No change required.
Adequate parking needs to be provided for Crypt School and any shops built on the green space adjacent. The school appears to have a good area which could be used for parking. Need better pedestrian links particularly to Shakespeare ave.	Parking	Noted. The Highways Authority will be consulted on all planning applications to ensure highway safety.	No change required.

Podsmead needs a bus pull in bay to help the traffic at Crypt School. All the rest I agree with	Highways	This is dealt with in 4.3.2. The Highways Authority will be consulted on all planning applications to ensure highway safety.	No change required.
Better parking situation at Crypt.	Parking	This is dealt with in 4.3.2. The Highways Authority will be consulted on all planning applications to ensure highway safety.	No change required.
They need to stop speeding	Highways	This is dealt with in 5.2.5 Design to reduce vehicle speeds.	No change required.
The parking situation at Crypt needs to be improved	Parking	This is dealt with in 4.3.2. The Highways Authority will be consulted on all planning applications to ensure highway safety.	No change required.
Traffic calming measures to stop people speeding	Highways	This is dealt with in 5.2.5 Design to reduce vehicle speeds.	No change required.
Improvements need to be made to the Crypt School parking system - the school should be more responsible and provide places for the coaches to park.	Parking	This is dealt with in 4.3.2. The Highways Authority will be consulted on all planning applications to ensure highway safety.	No change required.
Speed prevention measures are needed on a lot of the roads - people speed along Milton Avenue, Scott Avenue, Shakespeare Avenue and Masefield Avenue making it dangerous for anyone crossing the road.	Highways	This is dealt with in 5.2.5 Design to reduce vehicle speeds.	No change required.

No through road between the estate and the main roads (Bristol Road and Cole Avenue). I like that the neighbourhood is quiet, it's safe for children to play, we don't have the sound of traffic whizzing by.	Highways	Noted. The Highways Authority will be consulted on all planning applications to ensure highway safety.	No change required.
Alley ways are often filled with rubbish and have poor visibility which makes you feel quite vulnerable.	Security and crime	New development will need to accord with Designing Safer Places and the principles of good urban design set out in JCS Policy SD4 and the CP	Include reference to 'Designing Safer Places' SPD.
Great bus service but difficult to get to if you have mobility issues.	Access	Noted.	No change required.
I like that there isn't a through road between Bristol Road and the Estate - keeps the streets quiet and stops cars and lorries from cutting through.	Access	Noted. The Highways Authority will be consulted on all planning applications to ensure highway safety.	No change required.
No through roads please - we like that it's quiet	Access	Noted. The Highways Authority will be consulted on all planning applications to ensure highway safety.	No change required.
It would be great if I didn't have to go to town to do my weekly food shop	Shops and Services	Noted. Improving local shops and amenities for residents is one of the aims of the SPD	No change required.
More local amenities - fish and chip shop, takeaways, coffee shop - more spaces to meet people	Shops and Services	Noted. Improving local shops and amenities for residents is one of the aims of the SPD	No change required.
It would be nice to see it happen in my lifetime!	Miscellaneous	Noted.	No change required.
Keep the estate quiet, clean, green and safe for the children.	Environmental quality	Noted.	No change required.
Why bother?	Miscellaneous	Noted.	No change required.

Focus on maintaining your existing properties.	Homes	Noted. Comment will be passed on to GCH.	No change required.
The play area is not often used. School could have an exit on to Podsmead Rd and southern avenue. School is the only congestion point.	Open Space	This is dealt with in 4.3.2. The Highways Authority will be consulted on all planning applications to ensure highway safety.	No change required.
Trees are important - but the right sort - not too big. As well as car parking for each house there should be parking area for special occasions.	Parking	This is dealt with in 4.3.2. The Highways Authority will be consulted on all planning applications to ensure highway safety.	No change required.
High rise flats/houses are unsuitable and parking is an issue. People in new development in kingsways are parking in Asda.	Parking	Carparking is dealt with in chapter 5 of the SPD.	No change required.
Each property should have 2 off road parking spaces.	Parking	Carparking is dealt with in chapter 5 of the SPD. The Highways Authority will be consulted on all planning applications to ensure highway safety and adequate parking is provided.	No change required.
1. Trees are important and views. 2. There is some wasted green space that could be used. 3. If redeveloping, include shops and play areas.	Environmental quality	Noted	No change required.
Double yellow lines to make roads safer - people would park more responsibly.	Parking	The Highways Authority will be consulted on all planning applications to ensure highway safety.	No change required.
Very worried for people who have bought houses here.	Homes	Noted.	No change required.

Skate park and a no dog area for children.	Open Space	Noted. Further information will be required around open spaces and community facilities.	No change required.
Fish and chips.	Shops and Services	Noted. Improving local shops and amenities for residents is one of the aims of the SPD	No change required.
Needs Drs surgeries! Also parking, better roads and no blind corners.	Highways	Noted. Improving local shops and amenities for residents is one of the aims of the SPD	No change required.
People want to stay people want to move. I want a clear plan. Will residents be rehoused in Podsmead or gone completely	Homes	Noted. There are no plans at this stage. Any developer will have to submit a rehousing strategy and a local housing needs assessment to ensure that the housing needs of residents are met.	Expand page 40, chapter 6 to include reference to Local Housing Needs assessment as part of phasing rather than just rehousing strategy.
Error on ownership plan page 12. Tennyson Bungalows #25,23,19, 3, 5, 15, are owned privately as well as 51 Milton Avenue.	Homes	Noted. GCH to provide an updated accurate plan.	Ownership plan to be replaced.
CPO - won't be able to buy something equivalent to what we have now. Keep Podsmead for older people develop new homes elsewhere and improve Podsmead for older people	Community	Noted.	No change required.
Belgrave Rd - Empty homes could be used as well as Shakespear avenue no 6. No three story town houses. Parking on plot. Need 3 spaced not just 1 per dwelling. Car park for school at top of Scott Avenue. New access from Crypt slip road. Southern Avenue exit on to Podsmead rd. Dispose of old homes and use income to build homes else where, a new estate.	Highways	Noted. Parking is dealt with in the SPD and all planning applications will be sent to the Highways Authority to check they are supportive of the levels of parking and ensure a safe highway.	No change required.

No Townhouses	Homes	Noted. Proposed housing would have to meet housing need.	No change required.
Make sure community facilities are built and open before demolishing existing	Community	Noted. This will be dealt with through the planning application stage. A phasing strategy and community strategy will need to accompany any application.	No change required.
Increased parking	Parking	Carparking is dealt with in chapter 5 of the SPD.	No change required.
Park in safe place on Scott Avenue	Open Space	Noted.	No change required.
More affordable shop	Shops and Services	Noted. Improving local shops and amenities for residents is one of the aims of the SPD	No change required.
No 3 story houses	Homes	Noted. Proposed housing would have to meet housing need.	No change required.
Flooding needs to be taken in to consideration.	Flooding	Flooding is taken into consideration during the planning application stage. Flooding is discussed in 2.4.7 of SPD	No change required.
What is going to happen to those who own their homes.	Homes	Noted. There are no plans at this stage. Any developer will have to submit a rehousing strategy and a local housing needs assessment to ensure that the housing needs of residents are met.	Expand page 40, chapter 6 to include reference to Local Housing Needs assessment as part of phasing rather than just rehousing strategy.

Off road parking needed for new builds	Parking	Carparking is dealt with in chapter 5 of the SPD.	No change required.
Secure parking is important	Parking	Carparking is dealt with in chapter 5 of the SPD.	No change required.
Make community for older folk, it is a peaceful area. Council wont pay what house is worth. Should refurb.	Community	Noted. Any developer will need to accord with Policy A3 Estate Regeneration of the CP. This requires a justification for any development to demonstrate that refurb has been fully considered.	No change required.
Will need to increase sewage capacity	Miscellaneous	During any planning application process Severn Trent will be consulted. Planning permission will only be granted for a scheme that Severn Trent are satisfied with.	No change required.
Dr surgery and pharmacy in one building	Shops and Services	Noted. Improving local shops and amenities for residents is one of the aims of the SPD	No change required.
We need more car parking, not less. Future proofed hidden recycling bins.	Parking	Carparking is dealt with in chapter 5 of the SPD.	No change required.
Which homes are being demolished. Where will the new ones be built and how will you decide which will be refurbished.	Homes	Noted. No planning applications or detailed designs have been submitted at this stage to the council.	No change required.
Car park and slip rd would stop congestion from school round about to southern avenue.	Parking	This is dealt with in 4.3.2. The Highways Authority will be consulted on all	No change required.

		planning applications to ensure highway safety.	
Why cant the community own the land that the community facilities are built on so its always there for the community.	Community	Noted. This is matter beyond the SPDs remit.	No change required.
GCH have blighted our properties by having a plan online showing our houses demolished - Podsmead houses can't sell!	Homes	Noted. This comment will be passed on to GCH.	No change required.
Need services such as chemist, attached to drs surgery, as well as good shops. Don't want to move, I like where I am. Don't want shops by the play ground because of roads, Shops should be at other end of green so they are in walking distance. Podsmead needs looking after.	Shops and Services	Noted. Improving local shops and amenities for residents is one of the aims of the SPD	No change required.
Will I get full market value for my house. Can't sell due to plans. Why do they want to knock down my house for green space when there is green space next door. Can still find GCH plans online. GCH said " we will just compulsory purchase if you are not careful" Was told by GCH that I would get full market value plus 10%. Wooden stairs in flats on Byron, fire risk. Antisocial behaviour, arson and drug dealing.	Homes	Noted. No planning applications or detailed designs have been submitted at this stage to the council.	No change required.
Opportunities section for both SPDs should include tree planting	Environmental quality	Noted.	Include tree planting as an opportunity in 2.5
Podsmead, I question why Master plan has separated community facilities from local centre.	Community	Noted. It is not clear which paragraph or plan this comment refers to.	No change required.
Podsmead: 2.4.4 I doubt the geology here is limestone rock – almost certainly lias clay - would query this. 2.4.10 This is broadly correct and I see no reason to go into more detail at this stage. Best dealt with at Pre-App or as part of the DM process.	Miscellaneous	Noted.	Clarification to be sought around limestone rock.
Following our phone conversation regarding our concerns from a County Council level regarding the highway evidence which has not being provided, following Jamie's meeting with the consultants last years we have significant issue with the mention of an unjustified number of additional dwellings and other community uses in the Podsmead and Matson draft SPD's.	Highways	Noted.	All comments to be included.

<p>Therefore regarding both the Podsmead and Matson final draft SPD's we recommend the removal of the quantum of additional dwellings stated in 1.2.3 of both the Podsmead and Matson SPDs.</p>			
<p>In the meeting last year it was mentioned the transport evidence that would be required to determine the impact of the proposed additional vehicle trips on the surrounding highway network, junction capacity analysis and mitigation required. In the absence of such evidence the highway impact of the proposed increase in housing can not be determined and whether any significant impact on existing surrounding junctions can be mitigated. This would also be the case for additional proposed use classes (shops, community facilities etc.) if significant enough in scale to result in trip attraction from areas beyond Podsmead and Matson.</p>			
<p>It is sought that the transport evidence previously sought with the consultant is provided before mention of any quantum of land uses is stated and would suggest the documents are otherwise headed as Design Guides only.</p>			
<p>Regarding the Draft Podsmead SPD in its current form, considering the above I have the following suggestions;</p>			
<p>Para 1.2.2 bullet point 2 – Suggest remove reference to 25%-50% figure without transport assessment evidence to demonstrate figure is possible with achievable mitigation to surrounding highway network junctions significantly impacted in capacity or clearly state 'if appropriate highway mitigation can be provided'.</p>			
<p>Para 1.2.3 bullet point 2 – As per para 1.2.2 bullet point 2.</p>			
<p>Para 2.1.3 – replace 'good' with 'multiple' and insert 'regular' in front of bus services.</p>			
<p>Para 2.1.4 – replace 'easily' with 'readily'.</p>			
<p>Para 2.4 – remove 'technical' from title as this would require evidence basis.</p>			
<p>Para 2.4.1 – remove 'technical' and replace with 'brief'.</p>			
<p>Para 2.4.3 – remove 'the key' – evidence required to support statements.</p>			
<p>Bullet point 1 – 'replace 'good street' with 'several street' and insert 'generally' in front of the second good.</p>			
<p>Bullet point 4 remove 'within and'.</p>			
<p>Bullet point 5 – remove as no supporting evidence and conflicts.</p>			
<p>Bullet point 6 – remove without evidence of congestion – limit to facts such as some narrow streets with on-street parking.</p>			

New bullet point – surrounding main highway network junctions have identified capacity issues.			
Para 2.5.1 – remove ‘key’.			
Bullet point 2 – remove reference to main gateway, without evidence this will not impact on the safety and operation of Podsmead Road adjacent to Crypt School.			
Bullet point 4 – add to new development north in addition to Bristol Road.			
New bullet point – improve pedestrian and cycle linkages to Tuffley and Crypt School.			
Para 3.2 – New bullet point – Suitable highway mitigation that can be achieved.			
Para 3.2.6			
Bullet point 2 – remove, as this risks promoting incremental development.			
Bullet point 3 – amend, as this makes reference to the quantum of housing previously mentioned in para 1.2.3 with no supporting highway evidence.			
Para 3.6.2			
Bullet point 5 – include Travel Plans – move to bullet point 1 and change ‘proposed’ to ‘necessary’ mitigation.			
New para 3.6.3 The Transport Assessment would need to demonstrate that highway impact can be accommodated or adequately mitigated.			
Para 4.1.1			
Bullet point 2 – remove reference to ‘at the entrance to the estate’ without evidence this will not significantly impact on the safe operation of Podsmead Road and accesses for users. Remove ‘should’ include A1 shops and replace with ‘could’.			
Figure 4.3 – no evidence submitted to support illustrated proposed routes for vehicle improvements, potential linkages, Scott Avenue downgrade and proposed gateways based on survey numbers of vehicle demand and usage, and if appropriate to, on technical design compliance checks.			
Para 4.3 – No evidence to demonstrate suggestions are possible or appropriate based on transport surveys or design compliance. Therefore should be removed without evidence.			
Para 4.3.2			
Bullet point 1 – incorrect, developments cannot be expected to contribute towards enhancements unless evidence of significant impact.			
Bullet point 2 – should not state, without evidence, that making Masefield Avenue the main route is suitable in terms of existing and proposed traffic movements.			

Bullet point 3 – should not state, without evidence, the significant issue and suitable design for ‘simplifying’.			
Bullet point 4 – should not state, without evidence, of Scott Avenues importance as a route and impact of downgrading.			
Para 4.3.3 – No mention of improving pedestrian links across Cole Avenue to Tuffley, to Crypt School and north to new residential developments.			
5.2.22 – Remove and replace with parking according to evidence of demand and availability of suitable provision.			
"The Estate Today" - Podsmead has good access for cars, bus services to town, motorways. Challenge this as Podsmead is more of a giant cul-de-sac. Services are not accessible unless you have a car. There are some shops and community facilities about 1km away and the closest district centre is 3km away. Disagree that Podsmead has good views. Maybe from the top of the flats!	Community	Noted.	Check this is accurate and amend where appropriate.
Blackbridge is not part of Podsmead - remove it as it is a separate project	Miscellaneous	Noted. There is an opportunity to improve linkages to this facility but replacement community facilities will need to be provided within Podsmead as outlined in 3.5 of the SPD	No change required.
Can't access supermarkets	Shops and Services	Noted. Improving local shops and amenities for residents is one of the aims of the SPD	No change required.
The employment land is mostly industrial and not really employment. McDonalds is very low pay and the council must think everyone on Podsmead works in industry! Not really a positive	Community	Noted. Employment land is the planning definition of these uses.	No change required.
Walking routes are horrible with vomit and urine	Access	Noted.	No change required.
The west of the area is limited by barriers as larger vehicles were driving to industrial area, as well as it being used as a rat run	Access	Noted.	No change required.
The bus service is not good! It's the number 11 three times a day. You also can't buy a day ticket before 9am you have to buy a monthly ticket. Not affordable by most.	Access	Noted. This is a matter for the bus operator but it is agreed that	No change required.

		this is not ideal, nor does it encourage people to use public transport.	
Drains get blocked up and there's flooding in people's back gardens	Flooding	During any planning application process Severn Trent will be consulted. Planning permission will only be granted for a scheme that Severn Trent are satisfied with.	No change required.
the only way to improve access to the estate is to create more access. Plans reducing this eg Scott Ave (can only get onto estate, not off). Causing congestion on Podsmead Rd. Need to look at reopening and putting other methods in place eg yellow box at end of Cole Ave onto Podsmead Rd.	Access	Noted. The Highways Authority will be consulted on all planning applications to ensure highway safety.	No change required.
What will happen to the memorial garden? Ashes have been scattered here, so moving might not be popular. (Stone to commemorate Carmel Webb, but bot her ashes. British legion memorial.)But its seriously neglected and kids hang around there	Open Space	Noted. No plans are available at this stage.	No change required.
If the park is in the middle, will there be room for everything? There's only 1 set of rugby posts (to mark the world cup) and a five a side pitch.	Open Space	Noted. Appropriate community facilities would need to be provided as part of a planning application.	No change required.
Five a side pitch is well used in the summer. Its exercise. Could we use space in Byron Ave? Children need a place to run – see them using it every day. Blackridge is a bit far away. Parents might not be comfortable with children going there, especially at the furthest point	Open Space	Noted. Facilities need to be provided within the existing community.	Ensure reference to CP policy C1 in Chapter 3 Planning Policy Context. Provide clarity over community facilities to be provided in immediate area.
If Scott Ave is downgraded, this puts pressure on Byron, Masfield etc – seen as main route in. So this is not a good idea. Or we could increase other ways out	Access	Noted. The Highways Authority will be consulted on all planning applications	No change required.

		to ensure highway safety.	
At the bottom of Milton Ave there's some waste land, highlighted as contaminated land – but play facilities?	Open Space	Noted. There are no plans at this stage. Milton Avenue is not overlooked and is in close proximity to the backs of existing properties. This would provide an issue in terms of locating play equipment in this area.	No change required.
Green areas are good, especially for elderly and people with disability/young families. Need to find a balance between homes and green spaces	Open Space	Noted.	No change required.
The CAGs would like to stay together as we feel there is lots we can learn from each others' experiences • Initially we wanted to have an influence on progress but later down the line we want more of a say to ensure the development works for all, especially older residents or those with a disability.	Community	Noted.	No change required.
Buildings are quite old in Matson and Podsmead and definitely need works doing. We have a big interest in our estates – we volunteer/work there, so have an interest in how any redevelopment or refurbishment impacts on our communities. We also want them to grow. We don't want to lose the sense of community either – which is why we got involved	Community	Noted.	No change required.
There is an anti-social element and we are interested to see how a housing project might address this. Could be a game changer, so we want to be involved to ensure we raise the standards and reduce opportunities for antisocial behaviour	Community	Noted.	No change required.
Redevelopment is definitely a 'long game' but we want to see better and happier communities – with great housing, low cost bills, good insulation, addressing the 'bins' issue etc (currently have a problem with cardboard piled up – fire hazard – this is an issue for shop owners as well; people putting rubbish in commercial bins too)	Community	Noted.	No change required.
We were impressed by the Horfield re-development, with service roads, bins at the back. This seemed to address most of our concerns	Community	Noted.	No change required.

<p>The biggest issue is the negative perception people have of Podsmead and Matson. Even though statistics show that problems are not so high. We hope regeneration will design this out, creating a more connected, vibrant and positive community. Changes to the structure and open spaces are needed to achieve this</p>	Community	Noted.	No change required.
<p>Should there be a greater emphasis on the social value of Matson and Podsmead in SPD? There is so much good stuff going on – many ‘little gems’ within both communities that people may not know about</p>	Community	Noted.	Expand 6.2 to include community strategy and details of what this should contain. Be more positive in the SPD where appropriate.
<p>Sports facilities are in the wrong place (all in Blackridge) – people won’t use them</p>	Open Space	Noted. Facilities need to be provided within the existing community.	Ensure reference to CP policy C1 in Chapter 3 Planning Policy Context. Provide clarity over community facilities to be provided in immediate area.
<p>Siting the shops at the top of Scott Ave may help The Crypt but is this the right place to put them for the community?</p>	Shops and Services	Noted. Improving local shops and amenities for residents is one of the aims of the SPD. In order to attract shops and services they will need to be located where they attract more customers. Currently there are not enough people to support shops and services in Podsmead.	No change required.
<p>There needs to be more housing – and this can be done well or very badly. The SPD talks about ‘greater density’, but we don’t want a ‘shoe horned’ look. We also need a variety of garden sizes to suit what people want.</p>	Homes	Noted. Gardens provide opportunities for green infrastructure, biodiversity, and can positively contribute to health and wellbeing. Will expand to refer to variety of garden sizes	Expand 5.3.7 to refer to a variety of garden sizes for a variety of needs.

		to meet a variety of needs.	
Open space is important - to grow food, exercise etc – good for people’s mental health.	Open Space	Noted.	SPD amended to provide greater clarity over the approach to open space.
We need communal space and own garden area around flats, giving functional outdoor space for above flats. Important because balconies are too small (and some not even balconies). How about verandas like in Australia?	Homes	Noted.	Expand page 28, 5.3.1 to refer to functional and useable balconies.
Bike storage is also important in flats. Likewise for big prams. These are currently left in hallways	Homes	Noted.	Add information around flat storage for bikes and prams to chapter 5.
If you’re going to build 4 storey flats, given an aging population, then lifts are essential	Homes	Noted.	Add reference to accessibility to chapter 5.3 Building Design.
Traffic calming through shared space can be quite good, especially from the viewpoint of people with disabilities	Highways	Noted.	No change required.
People prefer houses, not flats. If flats these should be limited to 3-4 storeys. They also need to design out noise, keep warmth in and be cheap to run	Homes	Noted. Some people prefer flats and some people do not. Flats will have to be part of any development proposals that come forward if the LPA is going to meet its requirements to making efficient use of land but also housing need.	No change required
Design should look to reduce ASB in flats, otherwise everyone gets involved.	Homes	Noted. All planning applications must be designed in accordance with the community safety policy in the CP, JCS, NPPF and the	Make reference to Designing Safer Places guidance in SPD.

		council's Designing Safer Places guidance.	
Communal areas should look attractive rather than just functional – but will also need a better level of cleaning than at present, especially on ground floors	Homes	Noted.	Add that communal areas should be attractive and well maintained.
Flats should have plenty of internal storage too	Homes	Storage is an important part of well functioning home. Policy F6 of the CP requires developers to build to the Nationally Described Space Standards. The standards includes providing storage space.	Refer to CP policy F6 in Chapter 3 Planning Policy Context
We'd like our communities to be community-run, not done 'to' us	Community	Whilst the council can encourage a resident led process it can not insist on it through the SPD. Any planning applicant will need to demonstrate how they have consulted with the community.	No change required
Some of us would love a Costa (other feel this is too pricey), so there needs to be a range of activity/shopping options to meet community need	Shops and Services	Noted. Improving local shops and amenities for residents is one of the aims of the SPD	No change required.
Working from homes covenants could be included on new homes by developers to reduce parking. Or 'no white vans/business vans' parking. Or designated parking	Parking	The Highways Authority will be consulted on all planning applications to ensure highway safety and adequate parking arrangements.	No change required.

<p>Biodiversity enhancement</p> <p>This SPD could consider incorporating features which are beneficial to wildlife within development, in line with paragraphs 8, 72, 102, 118, 170, 171, 174 and 175 of the National Planning Policy Framework. You may wish to consider providing guidance on, for example, the level of bat roost or bird box provision within the built structure, or other measures to enhance biodiversity in the urban environment. An example of good practice includes the Exeter Residential Design Guide SPD, which advises (amongst other matters) a ratio of one nest/roost box per residential unit.</p>	Environmental quality	Noted.	Add biodiversity on residential units as part of section 5.
<p>Landscape enhancement</p> <p>The SPD may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green infrastructure provision and access to and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools for planners and developers to consider how new development might makes a positive contribution to the character and functions of the landscape through sensitive siting and good design and avoid unacceptable impacts.</p>	Environmental quality	Noted.	No change required.
<p>Para 2.5.1 could refer to "the quality and accessibility of open spaces" to ensure everyone can enjoy the health and wellbeing benefits</p>	Open Space	Noted.	Add "the quality and accessibility of open spaces to ensure everyone can enjoy the health and wellbeing benefits.." to 2.5.1
<p>Para 3.4.3 - would benefit from a stronger statement that streets are safe for pedestrians and cyclists of all ages and abilities</p>	Highways	Noted.	Add to 3.4.3
<p>Para 4.1.1 - to support healthy food choices, the mixed use centre should be truly mixed-use and avoid over-proliferation of A5: hot food takeaways</p>	Shops and services	Noted. This is covered by the Presubmission City Plan Hot Food takeaway policy.	No change required.
<p>We support the protection and retention of key areas of good quality green space as it promotes active lifestyles and supports good health and wellbeing, as per Section 4.2.</p>	Open Space	Noted.	No change required.
<p>The SPD refers to the high levels of green open space in the area. However, further consideration should be given to ensuring all residents are able to access them and that what is there is of good quality</p>	Open Space	Noted.	No change required.

We strongly support Section 4.3 as it refers to safe and accessible pedestrian and cycle routes both within Matson and beyond. These routes should be accessible to people of all ages and abilities. In particular, they should enable resident to use active travel options to schools, health facilities and the proposed mixed use centre. They should also be integrated with high quality green infrastructure to maximise mental and physical health benefits	Highways	Noted.	No change required.
Para 5.2.2 - we support the aim that streets should be designed for people, not cars as this will realise a range of safety, physical activity and air quality benefits. However, this sections could be more strongly linked with integrated green infrastructure to maximise benefits	Access	Noted.	Expand 5.2.2 to include reference to GI and health and wellbeing benefits of designing routes for people first.
Para 5.2.14 - this touches on electric charging but there could be reference to the benefits of ensuring electric charging infrastructure to 'future proof' the SPD. This could be included in Para 5.3.16	Parking	Noted.	Add reference to electric charging to 5.3.16
Section 5.3 - this section could be strengthened with reference to internal space sizes, which have an indirect impact on health and wellbeing, e.g. kitchens that are large enough to store and prepare fresh food	Community	Noted.	Add to 5.3
p.14 (2.4.2) typos reference 'Blackridge' rather than Blackbridge sports hub.	Miscellaneous	Noted.	Amend typo p.14 2.4.2
P20 – Land Use and Density Framework plan takes the open space loss even further and around two thirds of the central open space are taken for 'mixed use' building land – I really don't see how this can be justified. The existing Scott Ave open space is 2.08ha in size and the proposed 'improved' area is 0.6ha! This is just plain wrong. Why not site the 'civic space' (p.22, fig 4.2) right in the heart of this central open space – the proposed civic space location is plainly just leftover land, right on a junction and busy road – everything that is seen as negative in the site analysis. wouldn't it be better to build in some enclosure on that corner? What would be the function and purpose of such a space in this location? Surely a civic space should be located in the estate centre, near the community buildings?	Open Space	Noted. Any applications proposing a loss of open space will be determined in accordance with the SPD and the adopted JCS and CP policies.	Open space framework plan amended.
There is very little suggestion made in the SPD of opportunities to create high-quality new open spaces within the redevelopment, to help mitigate against any losses. Why not?	Open Space	Noted. This is discussed in 2.9 Opportunities	No change required.

<p>I do not disagree with the proposal (4.2.1) to provide a new and improved MUGA, although I would hate to see the play area destroyed, as it is individually designed to fit into the space and incorporates elements for all ages (toddler area is fenced for additional safety). In fact the play area and MUGA combined actually make this play space more of a NEAP than a LEAP, so it is currently providing much more than a basic play facility. First of all, to replace these facilities (even with like-for-like) would cost probably around £150,000 or more. To provide a decent sized MUGA (say 36 x 15m) with a tarmac or artificial grass surface would make the total bill probably nearer £175-200k. Who pays for this?</p> <p>Secondly, the existing facilities have been very carefully sited and laid out so that they provide the correct buffer distances to nearby houses – for the play aspect – 20m buffers and for the MUGA, 30m. If the MUGA and play were re-located to the reduced central open space, then the fenced MUGA would be very dominant in the space and there would not be sufficient space to provide 30m buffers to adjacent houses. A LEAP play area should be at least 400m² in size, but preferably larger (the current play area is approx. 1200m², plus the MUGA/covered seating area – approx. 300m²). To replace this existing facility with a smaller ‘improvement’ would seem like an injustice. Where would the informal grass kickabout area be replaced, where would the community sensory garden be replaced?</p>	Open Space	Noted.	Open space framework plan amended.
<p>The proposed skatepark shown on the open space at Milton Ave rings all sorts of alarm bells. Officers had previously looked at this space and discounted it very quickly as a place for a skate park. Firstly, the open space is elevated to the rear gardens of the nearby bungalows and users on ramps etc would therefore be significantly overlooking the garden spaces. Secondly, this is a relatively quiet area – skate parks are very noisy by their nature. Guidance suggests that skate parks should have buffers of at least 50m to residential properties, but preferably more. There would not be sufficient space here to provide 50m buffers. The only place that 50m buffers would be achievable is next to the MUGA (where the covered shelter is), and in an area which has higher levels of background noise already, which is where officers previously told the Podsmead community builder that a skate park could be located. The wellbeing of any residents located close to skate ramps should be the first and foremost consideration. Even if the bungalows on Milton Ave/Betjeman Close were to be rebuilt with houses facing the open space (which would be better for many other reasons) there still would not be a sufficient buffer space. I am not sure, but I believe that this open space has previously been</p>	Open Space	Noted.	Open space framework plan amended.

<p>built up with excavated materials, so there may be contamination considerations needed here too.</p>			
<p>p.23 states that there is currently 5.06ha of open space at Podsmead. In fact, within the study area defined by the SPD, there are three open spaces: Milton Avenue open space (PO5) – 0.918ha Byron Avenue open space (PO2) - 1.084ha Scott Avenue open space (PO3) – 2.078ha Total = 4.08ha</p> <p>The reduced POS on the open space framework plan would comprise: Milton Ave (unchanged) – 0.918ha Byron Ave – 0.6ha or less Scott Ave – 0.6ha Total = 2.118ha or less, a loss of HALF of the existing POS.</p> <p>The two other retained ‘green’ areas shown on the SPD open space plan at p.26 would not be classed or calculated as POS , as they are smaller amenity spaces of less than 0.2ha (and hence were not included as POS areas in the POS Strategy).</p> <p>This is not an acceptable level of POS loss, when considered against the proposals (i.e. no replacement POS and limited or non-existent mitigatory or enhancement proposals). It is simply land grabbing for the sake of building more houses, it is not an improvement.</p>	<p>Open Space</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Open space framework plan amended.</p>

<p>SPD's should be used to provide guidance on existing adopted policies within a Development Plan Document. The Matson and Podsmead SPD's currently have elements which go further than guidance and give prescriptive design requirements which development in these areas should meet. These prescriptive requirements go above and beyond the policy requirements set out within any up to date Development Plan Documents. As is set out within the Regulations and has been emphasised through the recent High Court Judgement between William Davis Ltd, Bloor Homes Ltd, Jelson Homes Ltd, Davidson Homes Ltd & Barwood Homes Ltd and Charnwood Borough Council¹, conferring development plan status onto a document which does not have statutory force and has not been subject to the same process of preparation, consultation and examination is not compliant with the Regulations. Any prescriptive requirements within an SPD are in effect policy requirements rather than guidance and should be removed and should the Council wish to assess applications against them, they should be incorporated within a Development Plan Document set of policies to ensure they are sound.</p>	<p>Miscellaneous</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD does not go beyond the adopted policies. They provide guidance on how the policies can be implemented in this area.</p>	<p>No change required</p>
<p>The link to the sports hub is a good ideas in theory but will not be an attractive</p>	<p>Access</p>	<p>Noted. The link to the sports hub is outside of the SPD area and would be dealt with as part of any planning application for that site.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>
<p>Route, again the route to Bristol Road is just picking up an existing route, I think they need to be a bit more adventurous in explaining what could be done to improve this route.</p>	<p>Access</p>	<p>Noted. The route would need to be designed in accordance with the guidance in Designing Safer Places.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>
<p>The proposed reconfiguration of the bus turning area, increased car parking on the Podsmead Rd/Cole Ave frontage (for Crypt school) and the existing footbridge would create (at certain times of day) a sea of cars fronting the main road – how is this a positive improvement? There doesn't seem to be any innovative thinking about the traffic and circulation space in this SPD at all.</p>	<p>Highways</p>	<p>Noted. This would need to be designed in much more detail as part of the planning application process. The Highways Authority would be consulted on all applications to ensure</p>	<p>No change required.</p>

		appropriate design and highway safety.	
p.24 (fig 4.3) Why has the decision been made to 'downgrade' (reduce traffic) using Scott Avenue and not Masefield Ave (where there are very few GCH properties fronting the road)? Why push the traffic into Masefield when GCH have much more control over the edges at Scott Ave? It isn't really even clear what they are trying to get the traffic to do – is there really a problem with traffic around the estate (other than on-street parking)? Why try to get traffic more quickly into the estate (i.e. at faster speeds)? Surely it would be better if all traffic was slowed down, to allow better pedestrian connectivity across the whole estate?	Highways	Noted. This would need to be designed in much more detail as part of the planning application process. The Highways Authority would be consulted on all applications to ensure appropriate design and highway safety.	No change required.