INTRODUCTION

In this report the following abbreviations are used

BCC: Bristol City Council

NSC: North Somerset Council

LPA: Local Planning Authority

BCS: Bristol Core Strategy 2011

BLP: Bristol Local Plan 1997

SA&DM Sites Allocation and Development Management Policies publication version 2013

NPPF: National Planning Policy Framework

SBL: South Bristol Link

AVTM: Ashton Vale to Temple Meads MetroBus proposed route

NFHP: North Fringe to Hengrove Project MetroBus proposed route

AQMA: Air Quality Management Area.

The report is structured as follows:

Summary and Conclusion

Application and Site Description

Relevant History

Pre-application Community Involvement

Response to Publicity and Consultation

Relevant Policies

Key Issues

A. Is the principle of SBL supported?

B. Is SBL acceptable in that part of the site designated as green belt?

C. Are the traffic, travel and access implications acceptable?

D. Are the noise, vibration and air quality impacts acceptable?

E. Are the visual and landscape impacts and the effect on the Malago and Bishopsworth conservation area acceptable?

F. Are the ecological impacts acceptable?

G. The impact on the recreation use and commoner rights on Highridge

H. Does the scheme adopt an appropriate approach to sustainable design and construction, crime and disorder issues and health?

Recommendation

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This planning application has been submitted to NSC and BCC and comprises a single carriageway road between A370 (Long Ashton Bypass) and Cater Road roundabout. An off- road shared cycle/footway will be provided for the full length. Within NSC area a bus- only link will connect SBL with the AVTM at the Long Ashton Park &Ride site. In BCC area, between Highridge Common and Cater Road, SBL would be formed by a widening of existing roads (at King Georges Road, Highridge Green and Whitchurch Lane) and new road construction (part of Highridge Common and along the open land reserved for SBL between Queens Road and Whitchurch Lane.

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (the 2004 Act) requires that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The principle of SBL and its proposed corridor is firmly supported by the development plan, specifically at policy BCS10. The planning application reflects, therefore, up to date policy and follows strategic reviews of the scheme leading to its inclusion in the West of England Joint Local Transport Plan in 2007. SBL is part of a wider package of investment required to support growth and regeneration. The route is safeguarded in the SA & DM.

Underpinning the SBL proposal is the access and economic benefits it will bring to south Bristol in particular but also to the wider sub region such as better access to the airport. SBL has an important role in supporting planned growth in south Bristol as set out in BCS at policy BCS1. SBL is also part of a wider network of transport infrastructure for the greater Bristol area, including public transport led proposals AVTM and NFHP. The challenges to the economic and transport benefits predictions by some objectors have to be weighed against the clear policy support in principle and the significant level of support for SBL from business organisations and individual businesses and residents. It is considered, therefore, that the principle of SBL is supported and very significant weight should be attached to this aspect of the assessment.

Nevertheless the environmental effects of SBL, including the impact on the green belt, still need to be assessed and these are assessed under a broad range of headings in this report.

With regard to that part of SBL falling in the green belt at Highridge Common it is considered that SBL is not "inappropriate" development as defined by the NPPF and, therefore, acceptable in principle in the green belt. Even if it was concluded that the development is "inappropriate" then it is considered that there are very special circumstances to justify this green belt development, linked to the economic benefits of the road and because the process of strategic option review over the last few years has concluded that there are no alternatives for SBL that does not require green belt land.

In terms of traffic impacts the information submitted with the Transport Assessment is considered to be robust in terms of its methodology, scope and outputs. This has enabled officers to understand and interrogate, where appropriate, aspects of the traffic modelling and forecasting. The predictions for

changes to traffic movements are considered to be credible for the wider area impacts and they enable a robust assessment to be undertaken of the impact on particular parts of the network including new junctions along SBL. In traffic terms it is considered that the wider network will not be adversely affected by the construction of SBL. This is not surprising as a purpose of SBL is to provide a new strategic highway route in the locality to support growth as set out in the Core Strategy.

The assessment predicts, therefore, a shift of traffic from the wider area onto the SBL route with roads such as King Georges Road experiencing a significant level of traffic increase. Conversely, other roads in the local area, such as King s Head Lane, will benefit from reductions in through traffic.

New or altered junctions along SBL have been assessed as performing within capacity at peak times in 2016 and 2031 with one exception. It is forecast there will be of higher levels of delay experienced in 2031 at the eastbound approach to the Highridge Road junction and westbound approach to the Queens Road junction. The junction has been designed in this way so that any significant queues occur outside of King Georges Road. Subject to further monitoring over the next 15 years it will be possible to consider appropriate interventions at these junctions to deal with the observed nature of queuing traffic in the future.

Highway and junction design has to take into account a range of factors including the strategic purpose of SBL, the needs of all road users and traffic types, , highway safety, highway maintenance matters, visual impact and land take. It is considered that a good balance has been achieved between all these factors within the design. A key factor in the approach is a proposed restriction to the number of vehicle movements available at the junctions in order to increase capacity, provide appropriate priority for pedestrians and cyclists crossings and minimise land take.

The scheme is supported in terms of its traffic impacts and highway design.

Residents living nearer to the routes of SBL, such as King Georges Road, Highridge Green and elsewhere, will experience significant increases in noise and traffic pollution as a result of increases in traffic. Air quality will still be below recognised standards and there will improvements on roads that will experience some traffic relief, such as Kings Head Lane, including improvements in parts of the Air Quality Management Area.

Regarding noise and vibration, whilst properties away from the SBL corridor are predicted to benefit from a reduction of noise and vibration due to a reduction in traffic, a large number of properties near to the SBL route will experience significant increases in noise and vibration levels. There are limited opportunities to introduce effective noise barriers near to the road and therefore there are concerns about the impact on properties that will experience increases in noise levels. However, It is considered that the correct approach to property mitigation is to adopt national regulation that will result in one property benefiting from mandatory protection and 88 others to be assessed by the applicant for discretionary protection.

The visual and landscape impacts of the scheme will be significant and it is judged that there will be more than substantial harm to the part of the scheme in the Bishopsworth and Malago conservation area. Elsewhere the visual impact of SBL is significant but the approach to landscape design and mitigation is appropriate, reflecting the differing landscape characters along the route. There will be substantial new tree and vegetation along the route to compensate for losses and help integrate the road into the landscape. A variation condition is proposed to seek changes where it is felt that full opportunities have not been taken to enhance the scheme design.

The major ecological impact is on Highridge Common. It is considered that this harm is compensated by the provision of replacement common land subject to conditions to require the establishment of an appropriate grassland to match the existing Site of Nature Conservation Interest at the common. Other ecological interests during construction can be protected by the use of conditions and opportunities along the route will be taken to enhance the ecological value of the new landscaping. The replacement common land is considered to be suitable in terms of location and size to provide an appropriate replacement recreational area.

The application has addressed the broad range of matters relating to sustainable design and construction. Taking into account the proposal to achieve a Very Good CEEQUAL rating and conditions to manage material use and the approval of the detail of drainage so as to maximise the use of SUDS, the approach to sustainable design and construction is supported. Matters relating to health impact and crime and disorder have also been adequately addressed.

Public reaction to the scheme from individuals and organisations is split. Objections are raised to the principle of the scheme, including views that the economic and transport objectives are not achievable or they are flawed. Objections to the impact of SBL include matters relating to green belt, ecology, landscape, noise and air quality. On the other hand there is also a substantial body of support relating to the need to deliver access improvements for the benefit of south Bristol economy and the wider Bristol area. Views are expressed that delivery of this scheme will greatly contribute to addressing perceived weaknesses in the connectivity of south Bristol for residents and businesses alike.

Overall it is assessed that the SBL will provide significant benefits to the transport infrastructure, as planned in adopted transport policy, and economy benefits for the wider sub-region and will support growth and the economy of south Bristol in particular, as reflected in the objectives and policies of the Core Strategy. It is considered that the submitted scheme, subject to some detailed design variations and the use of conditions, has mitigated its harmful effects as far as possible, including the wider and local traffic impacts or the scheme. Any residual harm, including the harm to the Bishopsworth and Malago Conservation Area is considered to be outweighed by the substantial public benefits of the development.

It is recommended that planning permission is granted.

APPLICATION and SITE DESCRIPTION

This report considers the SBL proposals within the BCC area. These proposals are part of a single planning application submitted to BCC and NSC for the construction of new, widened or realigned sections of highway which is 4.5 kilometres in total length from the A370 Long Ashton bypass within North Somerset to the Cater Road roundabout within the Hartcliffe area of south Bristol. Most of the highway will comprise a single carriageway road with one lane in each direction, except for the section between the junction with Brookgate/South Liberty Lane and A38 (Bridgewater Road), all within NSC area, where a general traffic lane plus a bus lane will be provided in each direction. Along the full length of the highway, in BCC and NSC area, a 3m wide off-carriageway shared cycle/walkway will be provided on the north/east side.

From the junction of the new road with Brookgate/South Liberty Lane, with NSC area a bus only link will be provided to the Long Ashton Park and Ride site where it will connect with the Aston Vale to Temple Mead (AVTM) MetroBus proposal.

Within the BCC area a more detailed description of the site, including the landscape character of different sections of the route, and nature of the proposed works is provided in Key Issue E were visual, landscape and conservation area impacts are assessed.

This full planning application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement.

RELEVANT HISTORY

Whilst there are a significant number of planning decisions made on land near to the route there are no recent relevant planning decisions within the application site of relevance to the determination of this planning application.

PRE-APPLICATION COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

A Statement of Community Involvement has been submitted with the application. It details the measures taken to consult and involve the community prior to the submission of the application and outlines how the scheme has evolved as a result of public engagement.

The Statement outlines that consultation commenced in January 2008 with development options followed by a public and stakeholder consultation from November 2008 to March 2009. This included a series of exhibitions and publicity of the consultation through North Somerset Council and Bristol City Council, and WEP websites, and press releases and articles within the Bristol Evening Post and local newsletters. A preferred scheme consultation was carried out in November 2009 and a funding bid was made to the Department for Transport in March 2010. At this times the planning and assessment requirements of the scheme were also investigated with both Bristol and North Somerset Councils advising that an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) would be required due to the scale and significance of the scheme, and full planning application would need to be submitted.

In May 2012, pre-application consultation took place in line with Statement of Community Involvement documents (SCI) produced by Bristol City Council and North Somerset Council. This was carried out over a period of 8 weeks from 4 May to 29 June 2012 and engaged different groups, organisations and stakeholders. Information was publicised on a dedicated website, distribution of 7000 postcards, posters, public exhibitions and the production of leaflets and consultation letters to statutory consultees, including local interest groups and organisations, outlining details of the pre-application consultation and inviting comments in response to the draft proposals.

Since this consultation there has been continuing engagement with Bristol City Council and North Somerset Council and statutory agencies (Environment Agency, Natural England, English Heritage) through design workshops, and meeting with local stakeholders. Meetings also took place with landowners and tenants to discuss land purchase arrangements and detailed route refinement issues as part of the final scheme evolution.

RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY AND CONSULTATION

In July 2013 26 site notices and a press advertisement were issued as well as notification letters to 1480 properties within the surrounding area. All of these consultation methods set out a 28 day response period.

In addition to our statutory consultation the applicant also carried out various forms of publicity and consultation as part of pre-application engagement and also a leaflet drop to potentially affected properties in the area advising that the planning application had been submitted and how representations could be made to the Local Authority.

Key Issues raised below are considered within the main body of the report but where appropriate some officer responses are set out within square [] brackets.

GENERAL RESPONSES FROM THE PUBLIC

321 representations were received from individuals and local businesses in response to the consultation, with 44% in support, 50% objecting to the proposals and 6% neither specifically objecting nor supporting the scheme.

Although this application refers to the section of the proposed South Bristol Link within the Bristol City Council administrative area only, representations for this application have been received from individuals, groups and organisations from both Bristol and North Somerset regions.

The majority of businesses that commented on the application are in support of the proposal. Objections to the proposal are primarily from local residents of Bishopsworth, Highridge, Hartcliffe, Bedminster and Long Ashton, whilst representations from residents of Barrow Gurney are mostly supportive of the proposal.

Summary comments from groups, organisations and political representatives follow this summary of comments from the general public.

MATTERS RAISED IN SUPPORT OF THE APPLICATION

ECONOMIC BENEFITS

- The proposal would instigate significant additional investment in South Bristol and improve efficiency of existing businesses in the area.
- The proposal would provide employment opportunities.
- There was strong support for the proposal from businesses of Cater Road Business Park and Imperial Park, Hartcliffe Way. These businesses commented that the South Bristol link will improve accessibility to the area for all employees and residents, improving the growth potential for local businesses.

TRANSPORT BENEFITS

- SBL is part of 5 major transport schemes which will help transform the ability for people to move around the city region - particularly by public transport – improved connectivity in and out of Bristol, improved transport infrastructure in South Bristol, much improved surface access to Bristol airport, provide much needed relief to villages and communities affected by the growth in traffic

- Traffic congestion and air quality along principal routes in South Bristol would be improved (Whitchurch Rd, Winterstoke Road, Bishopsworth Road and Kings Head Lane). Congestion in Barrow Gurney would be significantly alleviated also.
- The proposal is a necessity considering the on-going significant expansion and regeneration of South Bristol.
- The MetroBus scheme would advance sustainable transport in the region.
- New section of road will stop existing situation of traffic racing along Grange Road. [It is predicted there will be some reduction of traffic in Grange Road that itself would not reduce speeds but the introduction of traffic lights at its junction with SBL could have some moderating influence on speed].
- No objection to proposed changes to footpaths.

MATTERS RAISED AS OBJECTIONS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

The most commonly raised issues under this heading were:

- The environmental impact as a result of South Bristol Link road outweighs any alleged advantages or benefits of the proposal.
- The proposal would destroy countryside, representing an eyesore and a blot on an accepted valuable rural landscape.
- The proposal is not in keeping with Bristol as the 2015 European Green Capital City: Destruction of valuable green spaces and promotion of car use is in conflict with Bristol's Green Capital status and Bristol City Council's cycling ambition.

Other comments under this heading were:-Queries raised about the adequacy of the environmental assessment, particularly with relation to implications regarding woodland habitats, wildlife and flooding.

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT

The most commonly raised issues under this heading were:

- Traffic congestion in Bristol: Objectors were mostly concerned that despite the claims of the proposal, it would not address present congestion in Bristol and would likely increase traffic in the city as research suggests that new roads only resolve problems for a period of approximately ten years, at which time traffic will again increase. Submitted data shows that anticipated reduction in traffic flow and congestion in key areas such as Winterstoke Road is minimal.
- Traffic across Cumberland Basin: In addition to a general concerns relating to traffic congestion, objectors identified the adverse impact of the proposal Cumberland Basin section of road. Objections state that this section would remain a pinch point as all traffic travelling into Bristol from the south would still have to travel through it. The SBL would just redistribute traffic until it comes to the Cumberland basin

- Funding would be better spent on creating a coherent integrated transport plan such as integration of the bus and rail networks, and re-use of old railway lines (i.e. Portishead rail link). Alternative road schemes and routes were also set out by several objectors. [None of these schemes form the proposal and therefore are not under assessment by the Local Planning Authority]
- Proposed public transport service: Objections relate to the proposed MetroBus service, particularly that forecasted passenger volume is low and that the proposed service would not go into the heart of communities/centres, making it of little use to local residents. Objectors also stated that the areas of Hartcliffe, Withywood and Bishopsworth already have strong public transport services.

Other comments under this heading were:

- SBL and NFHP (North Fringe to Hengrove MetroBus) will pass within 300m of each other on Hartcliffe Way buy there is no provision for interconnections. [These routes connect at South Bristol Hospital]
- There is no segregation of pedestrians and cyclists along the route creating dangers for both parties.
- Contributors queried how the proposal intends to enforce speed limits along the road as vehicles regularly exceed the 30mph speed limit and the proposal will increase capacity. Use of speed cameras was suggested. Many of these representations stated that some residential areas of Bristol now have a 20 mph speed limit and that the same controls should be applied to the sections of the SBL road passing through residential areas.

IMPACT ON AMENITY AND HEALTH

The most commonly raised issues under this heading were:

- Proposal would result in increased noise, vibration, dirt and light pollution from traffic. Properties nearby were not built for the anticipated amount of traffic disruption passing within feet of property walls.
- Air quality within areas alongside the proposed SBL road would decline significantly due to an increased number of vehicles using these roads.
- SBL would further harm existing poor health in South Bristol Wards from emissions and health, and impact on sensitive uses such as schools.

ECONOMIC IMPACT

The most commonly raised issues under this heading were:

- Overall cost of the proposal: Objectors were concerned that plans for the SBL road are being progressed in a time of austerity, when public spending is being reduced. Bristol City Council currently has to find a further £80 million of saving on top of the £70 million it has already has saved. There was concern that if project costs rise, enhancements and mitigation (i.e. planting, habitat mitigation) may be cut back.[These are matters for the promoter of the scheme to consider and are not considered to be material planning considerations in the

assessment of the planning merits; requirement for planting etc would be a condition of planning permission]

- Business case for proposal: Objections state that there is a lack of supporting material, specifically the claims for economic benefit and creation of jobs. Concerns that whilst the project may unlock construction jobs, these would be temporary work and for skilled people and not employment for local residents that the planning application refers to.
- Proposal will not allow for extra capacity for growth, in particular new homes and businesses.

Other comments under this heading were:

- Loss of farm land: The economic value of the loss of farmland as a result of the proposal has been estimated by CPRE as £60M over 60 years yet this is not included in the economic appraisal. Additional farm land is desperately needed yet the proposal would result in a loss of this type of land.

IMPACT ON GREEN BELT LAND

The most commonly raised issues under this heading were:

- The proposal would cause damage to green belt land. Objectors commented the Local Authority should be doing everything to protect this land rather than jeopardising it.

Other comments under this heading were:- One objection from a resident of North Somerset questioned the reasons for having green belt land if another Council was able to ignore the designation and build through it. [This application is a joint application by both North Somerset and Bristol City Council]

OTHER

- This application provides cover for opening up the Long Ashton Green Belt in preparation for the 'Urban Extension' envisaged a few years ago in the Regional Spatial Strategy.[Any proposals for development in the vicinity would be subject to a separate planning assessment]
- Although a safeguarded route, this scheme has been rejected numerous times by the Council and is out of date.
- Proposal would result in the segregation of neighbourhoods and communities in the South Bristol area.
- Lack of detail supporting the proposal: No details on traffic mitigation e.g. provision made to avoid an increase in delays already experienced.
- Inadequate consultation of proposed development by the Local Planning Authority.
- The proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the property values in the area. [This is not a material planning consideration]

SITE SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS

SOUTH LIBERTY LANE CONNECTION

- Objectors raised concerns that the connection to SBL will generate a significant increase in the volume of traffic using roads that serve the Brook Gate and South Liberty Lane Industrial Estates. Specifically, it is not clear whether the vehicular operations associated with these properties and ease of movement to and from the Brook Gate Industrial Estate, will be compromised as a result. Representations state that the implications of that additional traffic have not been fully assessed as part of the wider proposals and such assessments should be undertaken, and appropriate mitigation measures put in place, before the SBL development can proceed.
- There is a major parking problem in the area and the laying of double yellow lines will in increase the problem of parking and servicing/ deliveries. Public parking bays proposed will only aid early morning starters.
- Is it intended to CPO land in front Unit 15 Brookgate and move entrance gates as the moving of gates will impede good vehicles when reversing at a very busy junction, which could give rise to highway safety issues. [No, but land is being acquired at the corner of this property to provide a properly formed junction and footway.]
- Will additional parking spaces be provided in place of those lost to make way for the proposed Brook Gate junction. [Yes, an 8 space off street car park is being built]

COLLITERS BROOK SECTION (BETWEEN RAILWAY BRIDGE AND YEW TREE FARM)

- No objections specific to this part of the proposed development.

HIGHRIDGE COMMON AND HIGHRIDGE ROAD JUNCTION

- There is a lack of landscaping to Highridge Common within the proposal to screen it from the SBL road.
- Proposal would have a detrimental effect on Highridge Common, making it unusable due to pollution. The constant flow of road traffic across the common would also disrupt views of the Common.
- Proposal will result in increased noise to Highridge Cottage
- Several residents raised concerns about difficulties accessing property that has direct access off SBL including the need for drivers to cross over the cycle path. [Wherever possible amendments have been made to improve the access to properties for others limited space has prevented this; in these cases the driveway is the same as existing so the manoeuvre is no more difficult but it is recognised that additional traffic on the road will require additional caution to be taken in accessing and egressing from property]
- Access to the Common proposes dropped kerb and island crossing. This is unsafe and should be replaced with signal controls or footbridges at strategic points. [Controlled crossings are provided at junctions and elsewhere it is considered that uncontrolled crossings are sufficiently safe]

- The proposed MetroBus stop at 183-189 Highridge Green would be better situated outside 177 & 179 as this has a larger area of common land. [This would take it further away from the inbound bus stop and link less well to pedestrian routes]
- The openness of the Common currently is a haven for many species of birds, animals and wild flowers.
- Local residents have grazing rights over the Common. [These will be provided on the replacement common land by separate approval processes]
- The limited movements at the Highridge Road junction will create rat runs throughout Bishopsworth and Withywood. [Movements are limited to minimise the size of the junction, increase capacity for allowed movements and pedestrian phases; drivers will be able to make strategic decisions earlier on in the main highway on journeys]
- At present there is no barrier between road and the Common and the application does not propose to alter this arrangement if the new road is built. However, some form of barrier should be required due to increased traffic. [It is not considered that there is an increased risk and a barrier would harm the open character of the common]
- Safety concerns with proposed uncontrolled crossing points along Highridge Green, particularly around the junctions and bus stops of Highridge Rd and Highridge Green, as well as contending with car traffic from Coxes garage on the corner of this junction. [There are controlled pedestrian crossings at this junction and the scheme has been designed to minimise conflict]
- Highridge Common sustains possibly the largest colony of Swift birds within Bristol and the disruption to this species and its breeding cycle as a result of changes to the Common can only be 'guessed'. The environmental assessment shows a poor understanding of the impact on Swifts.
- Well designed & effective planting along the boundary of the Common with the SBL road would prevent vehicles driving directly across the Common from Highridge Road & Four Acres to gain access to Highridge Green.

KING GEORGES ROAD AND QUEENS ROAD JUNCTION

- King George's Road is a pleasant residential road will be ruined by high levels of increased traffic, particularly in the morning in both directions.
- Proposed traffic lights at Kings Head Lane roundabout and the new A38/ Link roundabout junction will impede traffic flow. [Traffic lights are not being proposed at Kings head Lane: in any event traffic lights can be used to minimise delay and give bus priority]
- Grass verges on King Georges Road should be designated as no parking zones as this may cause visibility problems with people accessing driveways. [A condition is proposed to require further details of measures to reduce risk of parking on grass verges in addition to the proposed boulevard tree planting]
- Several comments concerned the risk that restricted movements at Queens Road will create rat runs and severance between the north and south of SBL. [Vehicles travelling north on

Queens Road will still be able to cross over SBL and turn left into King Georges Road; this misconception has arisen from one of the drawings in the Design and Access statement]

- A crossing point has been deemed "unsafe" by the Queens Head PH. If included in traffic light phasing it would be no more or less "unsafe" than any other crossing point on the scheme. [There is a controlled crossing on each of the other three arms of the junction; adding a forth crossing to this arm would significantly reduce the capacity of the junction with implications for traffic delay and pollution]
- Customer parking for the Queens Head PH is already problematic at lunchtime and early evenings on weekdays. Motorists will be forced south of Queens Road where no suitable provision exists. [People will not be able to park as close to the PH as present and there are opportunities to park further south in Queens Road]
- The Queens Head PH is sited at the ancient fording point of the Malago on the Bristol to Wells Road and requires further archaeological investigation, as does the Queens Road/King George's Road/Grange Road intersection. Further road construction would otherwise destroy any archaeological traces of this ancient route.
- Potential for flooding at the King George's Road/Queens Road/Grange Road intersection. This has flooded to a depth of 3ft twice in the past 12 months. If further hard surfacing is added preventing natural dispersal it seems unlikely that the existing storm water drainage indicated in the submitted plans would be able to cope.
- Access to houses on Kings George's Road would be impeded. [All driveways are incorporated in the scheme and a central strip is provided to assist right turning vehicles]

RESERVE CORRIDOR

- Reserve corridor land is located within the Bishopsworth Conservation area and is home to wildlife that uses King George's Road as a wildlife corridor from this section to Highridge Common. The development of the reserve corridor could therefore have wildlife implications.
- The SBL road would have an adverse impact on properties on Heggard Close (No's 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13 and 15) but the proposal makes no provision for pollution control to these properties from passing traffic. Earth banks and walling have been used in other instances in sensitive environments.
- Contributors sought clarification that surfaces would be best quality to reduce road noise and vibration, and queried if the proposal included any provision for sound or vibration landscaping, and air pollution protection from traffic fumes.
- A representation from Extra Care Housing, referring to its property Waverley Gardens on the junction of Queens Road and the reserve corridor states that proposed noise attenuation structures outside the property would be visually unattractive and recommended that it is replaced with further planting of trees and shrubs to enhance those already in place.
 [Landscape drawing 4 of 5 (drawing CTRAEB/730/LAN/523 Rev PA) shows that the proposed noise attenuation barrier along the reserve corridor would terminate approximately 20m to the east of Waverley Gardens and would not obstruct views of street scene activity of the new road]

HARECLIVE ROAD JUNCTION TO CATER ROAD ROUNDABOUT

- Motorists will access Hareclive Road to use the Gatehouse Avenue rat run by leaving the SBL road and then re-crossing it at right angles. [This is correct and is a consequence of restricting some movements at the main junction with Hareclive road in order to maximise capacity, minimise pedestrian crossing times and land take for the junction]

OTHER MATTERS

- Submitted 'artist impression' drawings are not realistic as they do not show likely traffic. Drawings showing relative traffic and MetroBus would be welcome. Furthermore, photographs of the current views of areas significantly impacted by the scheme (the proposed Queens Road junction, Highridge Road / King George's intersection, Hareclive Road looking east) are not provided.
- Some local residents have advised that as the implications of proposal on residential properties would be severe, they will be seeking legal representation regarding compensation for valuation and disturbance under the Land Compensation Act 1973 Part 1.
- Confirmation of the proposed start and end dates for construction works requested. The construction period of the SBL road would result in a major disruption to local residents.
- Page 6 of newsletter (July 2013) confuses Hareclive Rd with Highridge Rd. [The initial small print run did contain this error but was corrected in the second larger print run]
- Proposal would result in devaluation of properties and businesses in the area. [this is not a material planning consideration]
- The damage caused to foundations of properties on Highridge Green would potentially be severe, given the age of the properties and the close proximity of the proposed road.

RESPONSES FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

No comments were received from Members of Parliament. The following comments were received from Councillors:

COUNCILLOR MARK BRAIN (HARTCLIFFE WARD)

- Constituents are overwhelmingly in favour of this project, not just to relieve traffic congestion but more importantly to help bring much needed and better paying jobs to the area.

COUNCILLOR DAVID WILLINGHAM (BISHOPSTON WARD)

- Objection in part to the proposals for the South Bristol Link. Current proposals show a 3m wide shared footway/cycleway, which does not represent a satisfactory solution as the speed differential between pedestrians and cyclists leads to conflicts.

COUNCILLOR ROB TELFORD (ASHLEY WARD)

- Sustainable public transport infrastructure should be increased before allocating any funds to a road-building scheme that will have detrimental effects on local communities and the environment.
- Bristol's greenbelt land will be made ripe for development if SBL is developed.
- Proposal would represent a clear sign that Bristol does not take seriously its status as a Green Capitol for 2015.

PETITIONS

SUPPORT

There have been two petitions in support of the proposal.

1. Petition provided by residents of Barrow Gurney. Although it only refers to the North Somerset application, it has also been submitted to Bristol City Council. At the time of writing this petition contained 83 signatories with the following proposition:

"We the undersigned wish to confirm our strong support for the above application. It is vital that this long overdue link between the A38 and A370 is completed without further delay. It is time to recognise that an important regional airport must be serviced by an appropriate road system and efficient public transport scheme. Rural villages such as Barrow Gurney cannot continue to provide the "Missing Link"."

2. Petition provided by 'Better Transport 4 South Bristol'. The petition takes the form of eight documents covering the areas of Hartcliffe and Withywood, Headley Park, Bedminster Down and Uplands, Bishopsworth, Winterstoke and Bedminster (West Street), Parson Street and Bedminster Road, Whitchurch Lane and Citywide – Daily Travel to South Bristol. At the time of writing, the total number of 212 signatories with the following proposition:

"We the undersigned, support the South Bristol Link Planning Applications made by both Bristol City Council and the supportive case for the South Bristol Link made by both Councils."

OBJECTION

Although not a formal petition, copies of the same letter signed by 65 persons have been submitted. The letter objects to the proposal South Bristol Link road citing concerns with traffic increase, highway safety, the adverse impact on Highridge Common, and that the proposal is contrary to the Council's desire to reduce the impact of motor vehicles on communities. The letter requests that the Development Control Committee refuses the application.

RESPONSES FROM COUNCILS

NORTH SOMERSET COUNCIL

No objection to the Bristol section of the proposed South Bristol Link, subject to Bristol City Council being satisfied that in reaching its decision:

- Traffic improvements to Cumberland Basin within Bristol to further manage traffic flows from North Somerset have been fully explored with the object of minimising delays to public

transport services from North Somerset and those using the long Ashton Park and Ride, and all road users.

- Road construction and repairs within Bristol, not in relation to the construction of SBL, are fully coordinated with the SBL phasing in order to minimise delays and congestion on main routes between Bristol and North Somerset.
- That replacement Common Land is managed so as to be of a similar quality, character biodiversity value as that which it is to replace and that no additional financial liability will fall upon North Somerset Council.
- The opportunity for environmental and other benefits enabled by the construction of the SBL is secured through earliest possible completion of associated projects to enhance traffic routes relieved by the SBL, within the City boundary.

BARROW GURNEY PARISH COUNCIL

- Barrow Gurney Parish Council strongly supports the proposal, which would enhance the future potential of South Bristol and will improve access to Bristol Airport for travellers from across the region.
- Traffic through Barrow Street and the centre of the village, which are particularly affected by airport and "rat run" traffic, will be substantially relieved by the link road proposals.
- The proposal would enable better accessibility and therefore promote economic development in the area and, in doing so, should particularly help to relieve the Kings Head Lane area.
- The economic benefit of the proposals gives a Benefit Cost Ratio of more than 4, which is a very strong rate of return for such highway and public transport schemes.

LONG ASHTON PARISH COUNCIL

- The Parish Council opposes the construction of the South Bristol Link (SBL), which offers no benefit to the residents of Long Ashton but has many detriments. Whilst some other local councils may favour the road, its construction simply moves their problems to our doorstep.
- The route would cut through green belt land with consequent loss of farmland, amenity and wildlife.
- The road would increase noise, air and light pollution and CO2 emissions.
- The additional traffic forecast for the A370 entering Bristol would cause further chaos and limit access to Bristol for residents of Long Ashton and for all those travelling from surrounding villages which lie to the west of Bristol. It would increase "rat running" through the village and residential roads in Long Ashton.
- Many of the local footpaths would be severed by this road. The reduced footpaths would restrict access to the countryside and the ancient woodland would become threatened by the close proximity of the road.

- The economic justification for the road is largely based on the supposed value of a large number of small predicted time savings. There is no account taken of the economic disruption during construction, nor the economic value of the farmland lost or made unusable.
- The scheme does not consider the impact on local traffic of the measures being proposed by BCC to reduce car use and the measures being implemented to increase the proportion of journeys made by cycling. The link road would add to traffic problems.
- The economic case is based on traffic surveys carried out in 2009. There has since been a decline in traffic both locally and nationally, rather than the forecast increase. This challenges the validity of the economic case.
- The SBL would take business away from South Bristol. The predicted number of jobs generated by the scheme has no sound basis.
- Given the orbital nature of the route it would not significantly reduce journey times to the airport. (This is supported by the "Atkins" report 2008). The passenger numbers predicted by Bristol Airport in their expansion planning application have not been achieved.

WRINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

- The Council objects to the application and endorses the response from the CPRE, of which it is a member.
- There is no convincing evidence to show that the proposed road construction will result in employment generation, other than for those directly involved in the project.
- Claimed reductions in traffic flow through Barrow Gurney and along Winterstoke Road appear optimistic.
- The proposal would have impacts on public footpaths, semi-ancient woodland, amenity land and other environmentally sensitive sites.
- The proposal is essentially a transport scheme which is primarily intended for the benefit of Bristol but the impacts are primarily on North Somerset and the Green Belt.
- The proposed road would result in development pressures on the north side of the road, eroding the current boundary between urban Bristol and rural North Somerset.
- The green corridor and vista which runs to the south from Bristol acts as a unique landscape feature, is characteristic of Bristol, is a visual link with rural North Somerset and offers considerable aesthetic and environmental value. The land here acts as a natural boundary separating the characters of the Bristol built environment and rural North Somerset and this would be eroded by the proposed new road, adversely changing the character of both Bristol and North Somerset in this area, to the detriment of both residents and visitors.
- Insufficient information has been provided to justify the potential environmental impacts, nor is there suitable justification presented relating to any benefits which may accrue to North Somerset or Bristol from the proposed route.

- The 'network' referred to in the consultation documents. It appears that the Temple Meads to Ashton Vale Bus Rapid Transport scheme is now referred to as the AVTM route, although this doesn't change the probability that it would prove to be an uneconomic scheme. It was of course originally proposed in relation to the SW Bristol Urban Extension and without this concentration of potential bus passengers we suggest that the project is unjustified. Our understanding is that the scheme has only been retained on the basis that dropping it would risk losing other more significant DfT funding. This doesn't seem to be rational transport planning.

RESPONSES FROM INTEREST GROUPS AND ORGANISATIONS

SUPPORT

WEST OF ENGLAND LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP (LEP)

- The LEP strongly supports the planning application for the South Bristol Link which will create jobs by unlocking south Bristol to new investment and improve transport links with Bristol Airport.
- The proposal would radically improve transport in South Bristol, unlocking jobs and providing access for many more people MetroBus. In addition, it will give better access to north Bristol and provide additional links to the airport.
- It would assist us in improving access to work opportunities in north Bristol, reduce public transport journey time to the airport and make a significant reduction to traffic on inappropriate residential streets in south Bristol and North Somerset villages.
- The "greening" of the scheme plus the pedestrian and cycleways along the whole route, the South Bristol Link is vital for the whole of our community.

BRISTOL JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

- The Bristol Junior Chamber of Commerce (BJC) expresses support for the South Bristol Link.
- Proposal would not only help to improve the economic wealth of the area but offer crucial linkages for the wider community.
- It is crucial to Bristol's additional economic development and would unlock new jobs in and out of South Bristol and provide a suitable transport route to South Bristol and also additional links to Bristol Airport.
- Proposed pedestrian and cycle ways to further improve connectivity and health benefits positive benefits.

BRISTOL AIRPORT

- Bristol Airport supports the proposal and has committed to providing a contribution of up to £4.1million to the scheme.
- Greater use of public transport has potential to reduce CO2 emissions, as well as leading to less congestion and improved air quality.

- The Airport has good public transport connections to Bristol Temple Meads Station, Bristol city centre and the Bristol Bus and Coach Station with the Airport Flyer Express and through the MetroBus project, the Flyer will be rerouted, benefitting from improved journey times and reliability.

CHEW VALLEY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

- Proposal would improve connectivity for our members travelling north from the Chew Valley, make our businesses more accessible and reduce the amount of presently increasing through traffic.

BUSINESS WEST

- This scheme is a piece of missing infrastructure that is very important to the continued prosperity of the Bristol, Bath and West of England economy across local communities.

DESTINATION BRISTOL

- Negative feedback from visitors to the city seems to focus mainly on movement around the city and the region. The proposed South Bristol link will help to improve the experience and reduce this negative feedback.

BRISTOL ZOO GARDENS

- Road would ease traffic congestion, and thus reduce harmful emissions, improve travel times, while providing greatly enhanced transport links to our international airport from the heart of the city. The road will unlock the potential for growth and thus provide jobs in south Bristol as well as serving businesses and households throughout the city.

PARSONS BRINCKERHOFF

- Proposal would accelerate economic development in delivering and unlocking jobs for South Bristol and providing much improved surface road access to Bristol Airport.

UNIVERSITY OF THE WEST OF ENGLAND (UWE), BRISTOL

- Proposal would raise educational opportunities and job prospects in the city and for those living in South Bristol, and also increase access for job seekers to employment and training opportunities in the north fringe including major employers like UWE.

SS GREAT BRITAIN TRUST

- Proposal would improve visitation to cultural attractions in Bristol and North Somerset, and serve to reduce the number of car journeys to them.
- The connection to the Ashton link of MetroBus a very important and strategic enhancement of the economic, environmental and cultural life of the region.

CATER BUSINESS PARK

- Proposal would improve the transport infrastructure for South Bristol both for business operations and staff working travel, reducing existing congestion and pollution levels.

INSTITUTE OF DIRECTORS (BRISTOL BRANCH)

- South Bristol in particular has been neglected and urgent action must be taken to address its transport issues, particularly the need to improve links between the city and Bristol Airport.
- Proposal would create much needed jobs within the region.

BETTER TRANSPORT LINKS 4 SOUTH BRISTOL

- South Bristol Link would provide better access, traffic management & calming, less congestion and pollution; more options for travel; and underpinning long awaited regeneration of South Bristol.

SOUTH BRISTOL BUSINESSES

- SBL would directly encourage consideration to transferring from private travel to public alternative along with cycling and walking, and give better access and reduce delays and pollution.
- It would assist regeneration and raise the profile of South Bristol.

ALDER KING

- It would ensure that Bristol has a better selection of housing stock coming forward and greater employment opportunities in a part of the city where there are pockets of high unemployment.

VIRIDOR

- No objection to the proposal but a number of detailed engineering and technical aspects of the road design and construction were raised.

IMPERIAL TOBACCO

- A better transport network providing improved links to the airport, south and central Bristol is likely to offer economic benefits by attracting further investment.
- Pedestrian and cycleways will help promote sustainable forms of transports for employees.

AIRBUS

- Proposal would help improve the economic prospects of the area and boost south Bristol as well as the wider area.
- Good access to Bristol Airport is vital to Airbus as a global business and many other organisations in the aerospace supply chain.
- Congestion in the area would be eased for residents and staff.

BRISTOL SPORT LTD (ON BEHALF OF BRISTOL CITY FC AND BRISTOL RUGBY)

- Scheme would make a major contribution to increasing employment opportunities, investment and other associated infrastructure development locally and more widely across South Bristol.

- Proposal would provide increased opportunity for local people (particularly young people) and businesses.
- Without SBL, the transport infrastructure would remain inadequate making further important investment increasingly difficult for Bristol Sport.
- The proposed scheme would assist by connecting our business more directly to the City Centre, North Bristol, Bristol Airport and a range of other instructions.
- The scheme would assist in easing congestion on the road infrastructure around Ashton Gate, on both arterial routes and residential streets.

WITHYWOOD COMMUNITY FORUM & PARK GROUP

- SBL would support and enhance the businesses that are already trading in South Bristol.
- Proposal would greatly improve traffic flow, ease the congestion / burden on current routes and bottle necks, eliminating much of the current rat running through our area which exists.
- SBL will improve links South, North, East and West to Motorways and the airport etc. by giving an alternative route, thus reducing pollution by reducing the congestion.
- SBL will allow the growth / provision of better public transport routes and public transport connections such as Park and Ride.
- SBL will permit safer pushbike usage.

NEUTRAL COMMENTS OR QUALIFIED SUPPORT

ROYAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BLIND PEOPLE

- RNIB are keen to be involved as early on in the process as possible to ensure that the needs of blind and partially sighted people in Bristol are taken in to account in addition to those of cyclists.
- Proposals should comprise segregated cycle and pedestrian paths that are clearly identifiable to ensure that disabled people, including blind, deafblind and partially sighted people can use spaces safely and confidently.

BRISTOL TREE FORUM

- Proposals attempts to keep existing trees and green infrastructure and to plant as many as possible along the line of the route.
- Choice of species should be as large as possible to increase tree canopy for health, and address to climate change.
- Inner city orchards should be part of the mitigation as more tree cover in urban areas is more beneficial than rural areas.

OBJECTION

MALAGO VALLEY CONSERVATION GROUP

- Financial and environmental costs are self-evidently high and it's claimed benefits are unclear or implausible.
- Proposal would destroy Green Belt land, adversely affecting landscape, wildlife and amenity for recreational walking.
- It would adversely affect the character of the Bishopsworth & Malago Conservation Area without meaningful mitigation.
- The SBL would cut across Highridge Common and provision of alternative open space, which would not be as accessible to local people, on agriculturally improved fields is not an adequate substitute.
- The SBL would destroy the visual amenity of the residential King Georges Road and increase noise and pollution for those living there.
- The SBL route has not been reserved on the proposals map since at least the 1950s. Plans for a Bristol Ring Road were formally abandoned by the City Council Planning Committee on 23 December 1998 prior to the line returning in a new form as a result of the Greater Bristol Strategic Transport Study and subsequent developments.
- The reserved Corridor section has become a de facto park, which is a valuable pedestrian route away from the main roads, and it could be easily and inexpensively enhanced to make it a valuable open space.
- The proposal lacks a business case for the SBL and the economic arguments suggest that this application is premature as it rests on the existence of BRT2 Ashton Vale to Temple Meads, of which the Inspector's report into the Public Inquiry has not been published.

BRISTOL CIVIC SOCIETY

- The SBL would increase private car use by increasing radial car traffic into Bristol, noise, air pollution and loss of landscape.
- The proposed Hengrove to Long Ashton Park and Ride bus rapid transit connection (MetroBus) would be uneconomic and ineffective.
- SBL would sever the Highridge, Withywood and Bishopsworth communities, cutting facilities from residents.
- The SBL would increase urban sprawl into the Greenbelt.
- The capital cost of SBL including the purchase of land and associated expenses will exceed the current budget of £24m and Bristol City Council and North Somerset District Council carry the whole risk of a cost overrun.

- The SBL would fail to deliver the economic benefits claimed in the consultation documents. The effects on South Bristol residents are greater than the benefits to residents in some areas of North Somerset.

ALLIANCE AGAINST THE SOUTH BRISTOL RING ROAD

- Proposal would result in increased traffic, noise and air pollution, CO2 emissions
- Proposal would damage Green Belt land and adversely affect landscape & biodiversity.
- Creates potential severance between communities.
- Proposal has an over reliance on car transport and reduces access for pedestrians and cyclists.
- There is no evidence that there would be any significant savings in journey time to and from south Bristol. Furthermore, the bus rapid transit element is unsustainable and will not improve journey times to the centre of Bristol.
- There would be significant local disruption during the construction phase if approved.
- Funding provided by the local authorities, together with possible over-run costs is unacceptable.
- Lack of evidence supporting growth in South Bristol from the SBL.

SUSTANS

- Research/evidence suggests that additional road construction leads to extra traffic generation. This could be mitigated by a reduction in road capacity elsewhere, but this does not appear to be proposed.
- The traffic forecasts (2031) indicate minimal reductions in traffic flow on roads which parallel the SBL within south Bristol, due to repressed demand, and consequently marginal effect on peak hour congestion in 2031.
- Proposal shows significant increases in traffic movement in the forecast for residential roads in Highridge / King Georges Road, Bishopsworth, which would be detrimental to local communities, and discourage walking and cycling.
- The SBL would have the effect of severing communities either side of the route, adversely affecting community cohesion.
- The case for the SBL on the basis of Metro Bus provision is weak, as the forecast peak hour usage in 2031 with AVTM in place at 41 (AM max) and 16 (PM max) which could hardly be economic.
- The demand for cycle and pedestrian provision is not known, but making that provision if significant demand exists could be achieved at far less expense than SBL.

CPRE (CAMPAIGN TO PROTECT RURAL ENGLAND) AVONSIDE

- Although presented as a component of the BRT system, the proposal is a new road across open countryside in the Green Belt, making it vulnerable to future development. By reducing the capacity of the Green Belt to fulfil its functions, the proposal is contrary to the NPPF.
- The benefits for job creation are poorly evidenced;
- The public transport gains are minimal compared to the cost of the scheme and will require ongoing subsidy.
- The benefits to road users are based on very small reductions in journey
- The proposal would increase congestion in Bristol City Centre and carbon emissions in the long term.
- The proposed road would dissect precious agricultural land with a huge opportunity cost of lost food production.

CAMPAIGN FOR BETTER TRANSPORT

- Councils have failed repeatedly to look at more strategic alternatives such as rail improvements and tram, and, compared with these options, both Bus Rapid Transit and the SBLR are far inferior options in transport terms.
- Motor traffic in the area has been stable over the past 12 years, creating an opportunity to promote other modes of transport. Cycle traffic has risen rapidly in this time and but provision for cycling and walking is inadequate and doesn't follow current government policies.
- Economic benefits of the scheme are based on very small time savings for drivers which are based on flawed predictions on future traffic. Cost benefit claims also rely on this flawed information. The proposal would encourage traffic and harm opportunities for active travel and exercise.

THE OPEN SPACES SOCIETY

- The increase in traffic to Highridge Common is likely to reduce activity taking place on it. The proposed new Common to replace the area of common taken up by the proposed Link Road does not compensate for the loss of amenity caused by the loss of tranquillity for older users and the reduction in safety for younger users.
- The line of the link road would have a grievous impact on the Community Forest Path (CFP), a forty five mile path around the Bristol conurbation (on Public Rights of Way) that is used for many events, and would also cut across the South Bristol Circular Walk promoted by Bristol City Council and the Bristol Ramblers. [These are impacts for NSC to consider as none of these changes directly affect land in BCC area]
- A shared cycle-path alongside a road is not an adequate substitute for rural paths.
- Local cycling groups do not favour the proposal to put a cycle way alongside the Link Road and it would not suit cyclists, runners or walkers to have local public rights of way directed alongside the proposed link road.

- Proposal would make it difficult for local walkers and runners to access the countryside by setting up a barrier, particularly between the open countryside and urban areas such as Ashton Vale, Southville and Bedminster.

DUNDRY RESIDENTS ACTION GROUP (DRAG)

- More than half of SBL would run through Greenbelt land, which would lead to pressure for further development within this protected land, defeating the City's attempts to promote previously developed land.
- The Greenbelt and agricultural land around the city now accessible by many residents is a vital element of the attractiveness of the city as a place to live and work. The development on this environmental space for agriculture, forestry, wildlife, recreation & flood control conflicts with the council's aim to promote our city as a Green capital.
- The proposed SBL and BRT service will not reduce congestion overall. Traffic on most roads is estimated to see an increase in future years. The marginal benefits in congestion in some areas in Bristol are outweighed by the impacts on Local Communities.
- SBL would sever the Highridge and Bishopsworth communities, making residents have to cross a major road to reach some local facilities. Residents in Highridge, Bishopsworth & Withywood will have a major new road running through their residential area next to their homes introducing extra traffic, noise & air pollution to land adjoining housing.
- The SBL would fail to deliver the economic benefits claimed in the consultation documents

HANDS OFF LONG ASHTON (HOLA)

- Proposal would result in loss of green belt and farm land, local increases in traffic, risk of cost over run and expense to the council tax payer.
- The documents presented to support the scheme overstate the benefits and neglect the disbenefits. The information is vague and not supported by real evidence.
- Improved public transport and a cycle track have been used in an attempt to disguise a major road scheme.
- The transport assessment shows that the public transport service would be uneconomic and would require a subsidy at cost to council tax payers if the service runs.
- The proposed 3m wide path at is inadequate for a two-way shared surface and the junctions within the path make it unattractive to both commuters and leisure cyclists. Predictions for the number of cyclists using the route have not been presented.
- There are numerous footpaths, such as the Bristol community path which currently runs along much of the route from Long Ashton to the A38, that would be cut or blighted by the road and lose its tranquillity and become an urban path.

LIVING EASTON

- The proposal is effectively a road building project disguised with some bus priority measures and the cost of the scheme would be better spent towards a more sustainable transport project

such as the Portishead railway line and the Westway light rail project. Overall traffic is not reduced but would bar a small section of the A38.

- The proposed BRT is a poor value transport scheme not fit for a Green capital city. Projected passenger numbers for the service are low. The service also appears to have poor connectivity with the existing showcase bus network routes 52/75/76 and other services in the area.
- The proposed road would create a visual intrusion that would sever three local farms and disrupt existing footpaths, hedgerows and streams. Development of the road on Greenbelt land would encourage future development within this protected land.
- A major new road would run through residential areas of Highridge, Bishopsworth and Withywood, introducing additional traffic, noise and air pollution to land adjoining housing, local schools and services. It effectively severs their community.
- The proposed road takes land from Highridge Common, creating noise pollution around the Common which does not exist at the moment.
- The shared cycle and footpath provision is generally next to the road and raise safety concerns, particularly at proposed road junctions.
- The proposal is a large financial risk for Bristol and North Somerset Councils. Should the capital or other (legal/consultants) costs overrun local councils will cover all of the extra cost. As construction costs rise proposed benefits of the scheme such as cycle /pedestrian provision, habitat mitigation, tree planting will likely be cut from the budget.

BRISTOL FRIENDS OF EARTH

- The proposal claims the following:
- 1) That the road and BRT will help the economic regeneration of South Bristol and 'unlock' an estimated 2,350 net new jobs by 2030. However, there is no local evidence or an easily understandable explanation for these figures. The number of jobs predicted by the various reports since 2006 has varied considerably and it is impossible for councillors to assess if the 'requirements' for job creation in South Bristol will be fully met by the construction of a road.

Transport is not the major or main barrier to job creation in South Bristol The premise for the road and the view of consultants is that transport is the biggest single barrier in the way of job creation in South Bristol. The most important barriers are lack of demand from consumers, lack of funding for businesses and the squeeze on public spending, and these will not be resolved by a road.

The road will serve to open up greenbelt land, leading to pressure to low density development on Greenfield sites. This cheap land will then defeat any attempt the City makes to reuse less attractive brownfield sites for industry including in South Bristol.

The largest group of the local unemployed are those who lack skills and training and recent work experience. They need more local jobs for local people and small businesses require greater incentives to employ locals. A new road will make existing and new jobs more accessible to others more qualified from outside the area.

The proposal would increase the already unhealthy trend for more car commuting from North Somerset (2011 census) as presumably due lower economic activity, car owners are travelling further to jobs.

Businesses like local residents weren't offered a transport choice and would have likely chosen the re-opening the Portishead rail line or other rail projects instead. Business have been encouraged to support a road and BRT because they have been led to believe it will greatly reduce their journey times and local congestion and be a quality improvement in public transport. This belief is not supported by the current evidence.

The current much scaled down road and BRT design due to cost cutting and stop start nature of the road with numerous junctions and running through a residential area, means that the time savings for local businesses and others will be minute and reducing if traffic grows again as predicted.

We are not aware of any current jobs plan/strategy for South Bristol. It is not one of the main priorities for the West of England Local Enterprise Partnership as its economic and industrial profile does not fit the high tech, high skills, image of the region portrayed in the West of England LEP Economic Plan. South Bristol's businesses are not included in the key growth sectors in the Partnership's Business Plan.

Claim 1 implies that reduced journey times for all and a new' high profile 'road and BRT will attract new businesses to the area by giving the impression that South Bristol is 'open for business' and have a splendid new BRT network. And also that existing businesses will benefit financially from quicker journeys and lower transport costs and so create new jobs.

2) The road will relieve congestion and the BRT service will be an effective and quality public transport alternative to the car. That the BRT will achieve modal shift from the car.

The immediate effect of the road is to shift existing traffic to all residential areas on Highridge Common, King Georges Road and the reserved corridor where there are low traffic flows at present. The increase in vehicles predicted for those areas is far greater than the predicted reduction in vehicles in the residential areas, Barrow Gurney, Yanley Lane, Bishopsworth Road. This is illustrated by the supporting information.

The 4.5km road is three separate sections. There are numerous junctions on it slowing down traffic speeds. The route to and from South Bristol is the single carriageway pinch point of King George's road which is expected to have a 20mph speed limit under the 20mph programme. Neither motorists, cyclists, bus passengers nor pedestrians will have a continuous or particularly seamless journey. Time savings will be small and so mostly effectively without value. The information shows that journeys from the City Centre to Queens Road and the City Centre to the airport actually increase in journey time in peak.

Proposed journey time savings from proposed public transport provision are disputed. Not using the AVTM/BRT2 route Atkins estimate that a peak hour public transport return journey from South Bristol to city centre will save 71 seconds. Higher time savings are given for the airport service to and from the city centre.

When a new major road is built, motorists quickly find new rat runs to bypass delays on the new road. There is concern that one will be the Brookgate section of the road and Ashton

Drive could become rat runs between Winterstoke Road/ South Liberty lane and the Link. The existing rat runs of Kings Head Lane, Yanley Lane, Barrow St will still be available also.

Predicted modal shift is 0.1 or 0.2% and services would likely have to be subsidised due to low passenger numbers.

3) The road will improve accessibility to the airport, the city centre and strategic road networks (i.e. M5).

Public transport and road time savings to the airport will be very small at peak times and at other times, congestion is less of a problem. Airport passengers would prefer to continue to use the existing West St entry to the city as many of the passengers work at the airport and live in this area or leave the bus at Bedminster Parade, Temple Meads and the Bus Station. For all of these stops, the existing airport bus route would be better and we believe quicker. Car access to the airport should no longer be a major economic or transport priority.

Public transport access to the city centre is unlikely to be improved. Improving car access to the city centre using a new road defeats a range of Bristol City Council current policies to make the city centre more traffic free, to encourage public transport use to it by restricting parking and to stop commuter parking in residential areas. A new road undermines the attractiveness of public transport and particularly the Mayor's Residents Parking and Congestion charge proposals.

The 2013 time savings figures to the motorway (M5 to Cater Road and back) are not convincing because traffic from South Bristol will have to go through King George's Road. Businesses would be better served by less traffic overall. This road would encourage the already unsustainable trend of more car commuting by North Somerset illustrated by the 2011 census results. It is not appropriate for a Green capital when car use for peak hour travel within the city is reducing.

The following are six predictions for the Link:

Prediction 1: The BRT will probably never run as it will be a financial liability that no Council will be willing to take on. No bus operator would ever have considered this roundabout bus route as a commercial prospect.

Prediction 2: Within a few years, 'relieved' major roads will have filled up again with peak hour traffic, leading to rat running elsewhere. The daily lives of present and future residents of Highridge and Bishopsworth will be made permanently more miserable and unpleasant by the Link bringing more traffic, noise and air pollution through the middle of their community.

Prediction 3: The capital cost of the road will rise substantially. Cost cutting will lead to the scaling down of the mitigation measures to alleviate the many adverse environmental impacts of the road and the cycling and walking provision. Other Council budgets will be raided to meet the extra costs.

Prediction 4: Both Councils will face planning applications for the development of new housing in the Green Belt and the pressure for this will be unstoppable. The argument will be 'why not fill in the space between existing housing and the road' and the City's South West greenbelt will be gone forever.

Prediction 5: The countryside footpath network will be decimated discouraging local recreational walking and the use of longer distance footpaths due to noise and air pollution. The pleasant agricultural landscape will be scarred and four farms severed. The exposed and poor quality proposed new cycle/footway next to the road will be too narrow to be safe, unpleasant to use and involve crossing numerous junctions. This will discourage commuter and recreational cycling and walking. Residents of Highridge and Withywood will be reluctant to let their children use out to use or themselves go to either Highridge Common or the reserved corridor due to the presence of traffic 24 hours a day.

Prediction 6: That the Link's construction along with that of AVTM/BRT2 and BRT3 will be an extreme political embarrassment about the time that the City becomes a Green Capital and is in the public spotlight. The construction of three BRTs and a road simultaneously will cause severe disruption to the existing road, bus and cycle network. Residents don't want consultant led development for South Bristol – the area is not the basket case portrayed in the literature. South Bristol has a fantastic environment with lots of great potential and great people who could do business in a green and different way. And it doesn't start with taking away the greenbelt in our backyard.

BRISTOL RAMBLERS GROUP

- The proposal would adversely impact the character of an important area of countryside as close as any to Bristol city centre; and also the nature of a number of attractive rural footpaths that are easily accessible from urban Bristol. This is contrary to the European Green City aspiration for promoting suburban walking.
- Much of the new road would be in green belt and would be an audible and visual intrusion. Surrounding footpaths are well-used by walking groups and by individuals, and the scheme would destroy the recreational value of many routes. The destruction of an attractive recreational route cannot therefore be offset by the creation of a path along a major road.
- A number of paths would be diverted and in several cases being replaced by cycle tracks alongside the new road. This would change the paths from ones in a quiet rural setting to ones alongside a noisy road, sometimes shared with cyclists.
- Adversely affected include Ashton Vale (Brookgate) and Bedminster Down, The South Bristol Circular Walk (the section from Highridge Green to the Park and Ride would be spoilt) and The Avon Community Forest Path.
- If the scheme proceeds because the benefits are judged to outweigh the costs to walkers and others, the design should be changed to make walking safer. It is not acceptable to design a major new road which walkers are expected to cross without a footbridge or traffic signals. The current plans include footpaths crossing roads on the level with non-signalised crossings.
- A specific objection is to the road crossing Highridge Common, which is a popular walking area for local people.

BRISTOL CYCLING CAMPAIGN

- The scheme would lead to creating environmental problems due to both increased motor vehicle usage and damage to the countryside area.

- The proposed "Metro Bus" scheme offers poor return on investment, little benefit to nonmotorised users and poor cycling provision.
- There is a strong case for a cycle/pedestrian link connecting Long Ashton-Ashton Vale-Withywood-Hartcliffe, in its own right. This should be designed to link with origins and destinations and to minimise visual intrusiveness.
- We support comments made by other parties with respect to the need for quality cycling provision in any such scheme for it to go ahead.
- SBL cycle/pedestrian provision
- General comments
- A 3m width without a 0.5m buffer or vegetation alongside high speed roads offers inadequate protection from passing vehicles. Furthermore, randomly placed street lighting columns are in the cycletrack in certain locations would create multiple hazards.
- The detailed design and treatment, particularly the stop-start nature of the South Bristol section (6 junction crossings) is inappropriate for a purpose designed cycletrack for a commuters.
- Lack of lighting on rural section will discourage cycle and pedestrian use, and therefore some form of lower key lighting should be implemented.
- No evidence to suggest that the cycle and walking provision has been considered alongside both existing and planned (strategic) networks, which will require a comprehensive review of existing and new signing.
- A separate cross-country cycletrack linking up with local communities would be preferred to this roadside cycletrack proposal.
- Detailed comments (only those relevant to the Bristol section are listed here)
- The cycletrack needs to continue east of the Cater Road access to tie up with Malago Greenway connections. SBL should achieve continuity as it is doing for motorised traffic. This will involve dealing with the pinch point at the pedestrian bridge on this section. [Agreed: a condition is proposed to require this connection to be made]
- No separate access from the cycletrack to Lidl supermarket. Cycletrack stops at an arbitrary point at the mouth of the Lidl access: Whitland Road and Old Whitchurch Lane offers a quiet route but there is no cycle link into it from the scheme. [Agreed: a condition is proposed to require these connections to be improved]
- A number of locations are identified where there is no radius at junctions between paths on cycletracks. [Agreed: condition to be used to secure these in further detailed plans to be submitted]
- Multiple crossings of private drives King George Road-not clear how cycletrack priority and safety will be provided. Cyclists may well choose to us the carriageway, although median strip will ensure that they are pinched by traffic. [At the detailed stage the choice of materials and

lining will be used to minimise conflict: it is intended that some cyclists will used the carriageway of this 30 mph road; the carriageway is no narrower at the crossing points]

- Cyclists will be 'pinched' in the elongated central strip in the reserve corridor and at the uncontrolled crossing at Highridge common. [The carriageway is no narrower than elsewhere so no pinch points are created]

TRANSPORT FOR GREATER BRISTOL ALLIANCE

- The proposal is a new road through the Greenbelt with an uneconomic Bus Rapid Transit attached to promote it as part of an integrated rapid transit network. The public has indicated their preference for rail rapid transit and for generally lower bus fares rather than BRT. Businesses have supported BRT because it appeared to be the only option.
- New road would increase car journeys and congestion overall.
- The South Bristol Link BRT is unlikely to operate due to the cost of subsidising for local Councils and bus operators will not operate a route without large financial incentives. According to a transport consultant employed to look at the business case at the public enquiry, the AVTM/BRT2 route via Temple Meads was based on flawed surveys and poor quality modelling leading to the wrong choice of route (via Temple Meads). The SBL BRT service will be a continuation of the AVTM service and (we are told) subsidised by it. Predicted passenger numbers for AVTM in the peak hour is only 50 more than the existing Long Ashton Park & Ride service (for a capital cost of £52m) so there is little chance of profit from it being used to subsidise the SBL BRT service.
- The Link Road is poor value for money as a road. The varying speed limits, a pinch point at King George's Road and repeated junctions, and its overall impact would lead to the growth of traffic all over the adjacent road network (which is projected by the consultants) so its impact on peak hour congestion will be tiny. The predicted time savings mostly in seconds are minute.
- Road traffic in the city has been reducing in recent years and the proposal would be an unsustainable backward step. It is contrary to the Mayors introduction of residents parking and consideration to congestion charging in order to reduce traffic. Traffic reduction is a transport opportunity for the Council to take away road capacity from cars and give it to sustainable modes in order to reduce traffic still further.
- There is no evidence that the scheme attempts to integrate different types of public transport and the provision for cyclists and pedestrians along the route is poor. Both groups are expected to share a single 3 metre strip right next to the road, which would be inadequate protection from passing vehicles. Its design is not in accord with good cycling design or current Bristol City Council aspirations for new cycle facilities. The proposal would also decimate the local footpath network.

BRISTOL VISUAL & ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP

- The proposal should apply the protocol agreed between the Council's planning and highways department. It should not maximise highway expenditure in Bristol.

FOREST OF AVON TRUST (principally a matter for North Somerset Council)

- The Forest of Avon Trust offers the following Without Prejudice comments on the South Bristol Link (SBL), in the context of the Forest of Avon Plan and Developer's Guide.
- The Landscape proposals do not adequately reflect the road's location within a prominent part of the Forest of Avon Community Forest. Considering the proposed developments' prominent location and the objectives of the Forest of Avon, consideration should be given to engagement with all landowners in an area between Ashton Vale, Ashton Court/ B3128, Barrow Common and Highridge to promote landscape enhancement to mitigate the impact on the immediate corridor and provide a positive commitment to the area's green credentials.
- The principle of establishing the new area of woodland as set out in Landscape Proposals is welcomed. Detailed proposals however, require consideration.
- There is an opportunity to run 'Garden Forest' projects on St. George's Road to complement the proposed street tree planting. Engagement with residents regarding private planting should take place to encourage uptake.
- Proposal would have a significant impact on the amenity of the Community Forest Path, an important recreational route. Detail should ensure that crossings encourage rather than deter access. Small scale improvements to this section of the Community Forest Path and improvements including signage, waymarking and gates should be secured by through funding.

RESPONSES FROM INTERNAL CONSULTEES

BCC TRANSPORT (DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT)

Comments are incorporated into the main body of the report principally in key issue C

BCC AIR QUALITY

Summary: The assessment methodology is robust and has been carried out to the required standard. The scheme does not lead to any additional exceedences of air quality strategy objectives limits and in certain areas of the AQMA, substantial improvements in air quality are predicted, therefore, I do not have any particular concerns with regards to air quality with the proposed development.

In many locations within the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) the scheme is predicted to have beneficial effects, particularly in the Bedminster area around Parsons Street station where it is predicted that traffic conditions will be eased and ambient pollution concentrations will fall.

Detail: The main pollutants of concern that have been considered in the assessment are Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2) and Particulate Matter < 10 microns in diameter (PM10). NO2 and PM10 are important in terms of public health. Mandatory European Union air quality limit values are given in The Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010. At the local level these limit values have been adopted and are to be achieved through the UK Government's Air Quality Strategy. These limit values are based on the assessment of the effects of each pollutant on human health, including the effects on sensitive subgroups.

The Government's Air Quality Strategy sets Air Quality Strategy Objectives (AQSO). These are targets, expressed as a maximum ambient concentration not to be exceeded, either without exception

or with a permitted number of exceedences, within a specified timescale. The air quality assessment for the South Bristol Link compares modelled pollutant levels with these AQSO's.

Descriptors for the scale of predicted changes in air quality have been provided in Environmental Protection UK's (EPUK) 'Development Control: Planning for Air Quality (2010 Update) document. These take into account the magnitude of change in predicted pollutant levels and the how close to the AQSO limits the pollutant concentration is. These significance criteria have been used in order to describe the predicted changes in air quality associated with the South Bristol Link.

'Large' increases in NO2 pollutant levels are predicted along the South Bristol Link route, in particular, from the Highridge Green Section through to the Cater Road Roundabout. However, the significance of these increases have been classified as 'slight adverse' as pollutant concentrations are still likely to be substantially lower than the relevant air quality objectives.

The long term annual objective for NO2 is $40\mu g/m3$. At the locations predicted to have the largest increases in annual NO2 concentrations on King Georges Road, Bridgewater Road and Highridge Green, the worst case modelled NO2 concentrations were predicted to be 26.4 $\mu g/m3$, 28.5 $\mu g/m3$ and $33\mu g/m3$ respectively. These concentrations are still well below the annual AQSO limits for NO2. As this is a worst case scenario, actual concentrations are likely to be lower than the figures stated. The predicted increases in annual NO2 concentrations at these locations range from 5.9 $\mu g/m3$ to 9.9 $\mu g/m3$.

The annual objective limit for PM10 is 40µg/m3. Increases in PM10 are also predicted along this section of the South Bristol Link with a maximum increase of 0.5µg/m3 being predicted and a maximum annual PM10 concentration of 14.8µg/m3. These concentrations are well below the AQSO limits for PM10.

Inside Bristol's AQMA at three modelled locations within BCC's air quality management area, a small worsening of air quality has been predicted. All three modelled receptors are located within Blackmoors Lane. The predicted increase ranges from 0.9µg/m3 to 1.2µg/m3 with a worst case annual NO2 value of 38.5µg/m3 being predicted. A less conservative prediction of NO2 concentrations has been modelled with the lower estimate of annual NO2 levels for Blackmoors Lane being 31.3µg/m3. It is likely that concentrations will fall somewhere between these two modelled annual means. Changes in PM10 concentrations on Blackmoors Lane are described as 'imperceptible' with a maximum increase of 0.1µg/m3 being predicted.

Not all locations within the AQMA experience exceedences of the AQSO's. Modelled annual NO2 concentrations show that despite the small predicted increase in NO2 at these locations in Blackmoors Lane, AQSO's objective limits will be met with the South Bristol Link in operation.

BCC POLLUTION CONTROL : NOISE

Initial comments raised a range of queries and request for further information that gave rise to additional information and explanations from the applicant. As a result final and updated comments from your pollution control officer are as follows:

I have considered the Environmental Statement 2.11 Noise and Vibration Assessment. The methodology of the assessment was carried out with the relevant sections of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11 Section 3 Part 7. The assessment of effects was also explained with regards to comparisons between levels with the scheme (do something) and without

the scheme (do minimum). Regard was given to relevant guidance and standards and threshold values for adverse and significant effects of noise were provided at table 11-3. The methodology of assessment and presentation of results is likely to be reliable.

It is explained that 5937 residential and 16 non-residential noise sensitive receptors have been assessed and impact classified. A proportion of properties particularly on roads away from the scheme will perceive no change in noise levels or a reduction in noise. Other properties will have moderate impacts i.e. properties with an increase in noise level of between 3 and 4.9dBA and others will have major impacts i.e. 5dBA increase or more in the opening year (>10dBA design year). Many of the properties with highest impacts (up to 20dBA change) will be along the new road through the reserved corridor. These properties are listed in table 5 in the additional technical note from Atkins dated 8 November 2013 showing approximately 150 addresses with moderate impacts and approximately 90 properties with major impacts.

Properties with a major change are of most concern and in the new section of road only one property, 12 Innox Gardens, qualifies for an offer of sound insulation to the façade under Regulation 3 of the Noise Insulation Regulations 1975 (mandatory for new roads) as levels at the property may exceed 63dB LAeq 16hr free field or façade levels of 68dBA L10 18hr. Other properties very close to this fall just outside the requirement for the protection above i.e. 14 Innox Gardens and many others so will receive no help. Such protection would only have included secondary glazing, alternative ventilation, replacement door, if necessary, and such works will not help outdoor amenity space such as the many rear gardens along the reserved corridor. The applicants approach to this issue and the fact that many of these properties will experience noise levels higher than those in recognised design standards as a result of the road is explained in the email from the aplicatn dated 8 November 2013. Please note that when considering new applications for residential development in these areas the noise from the road will need to be taken into account and it is likely that any development would need to provide a scheme of noise mitigation to ensure external and internal noise levels are in line with relevant guideline values.

Additional Atkins technical note dated 1 November 2013 identifies 88 properties (on King Georges Rd, Highridge Green, Highridge Rd and Queens Rd) which exceed the same values in the Noise Insulation Regulations and therefore will qualify for an offer of façade sound insulation from the Highways Authority under Regulation 4 of the Noise Insulation Regulations. This is discretionary and the email from the applicant of 8 November 2013 explains that such offers will depend on how costs of providing them will impact on the delivery of the scheme as a whole. I do however welcome the proposed offer to work with the Planning Authority. This technical note also identifies 4 properties within 40m of the scheme (excluding Waverly Gardens who will benefit from a noise barrier) which will experience a >10% increase in airborne vibration which are not eligible for the façade sound insulation.

The applicants email of 8 November 2013 also explains the applicants consideration of noise effect on PROW and public amenity spaces.

A detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan CEMP should be conditioned to cover the following aspects:

- 1. Procedures for maintaining good public relations including complaint management, public consultation and liaison
- 2. Arrangements for liaison with the Council's Pollution Control Team

- 3. All works and ancillary operations which are audible at the site boundary, or at such other place as may be agreed with the Local Planning Authority, shall be carried out only between the following hours:
- 4. 08 00 Hours and 18 00 Hours on Mondays to Fridays and 08 00 and 13 00 Hours on Saturdays and; at no time on Sundays and Bank Holidays.
- 5. Deliveries to and removal of plant, equipment, machinery and waste from the site must only take place within the permitted hours detailed above.
- 6. Mitigation measures as defined in BS 5528: Parts 1 and 2 : 2009 Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open Sites shall be used to minimise noise disturbance from construction works.
- 7. Procedures for emergency deviation of the agreed working hours.
- 8. Bristol City Council encourages all contractors to be 'Considerate Contractors' when working in the city by being aware of the needs of neighbours and the environment.
- 9. Control measures for dust and other air-borne pollutants. This must also take into account the need to protect any local resident who may have a particular susceptibility to air-borne pollutants.
- 10. Measures for controlling the use of site lighting whether required for safe working or for security purposes.

In conclusion any mitigation of noise that has been offered, other than a barrier at Waverly Gardens, has been restricted to that of the statutory obligation required by the Noise Insulation Regulations 1975 as amended 1988 made under the regime of Part II of the Land Compensation Act 1973. This will include façade insulation to one property and may include façade insulation to a further 88 properties.

BCC POLLUTION CONTROL: CONTAMINATION

Due to the proposed end use of this development the risk to public health from existing contamination is low – roads are not sensitive receptors but there is the potential for the construction and operation of the new road to cause contamination or create pathways.

I am not going to recommend full site investigation along the Bristol section of the route but I do advise the applicant to undertake a more through geotechnical investigation (if not already done so). I would ask the Construction Environment Management Plan has certain sections added to it:

I have reviewed the "Pre-Construction Environment Management Plan" the section on Contaminated Land in the final CEMP should include a strategy of dealing with unexpected contamination. I also ask that the Materials Management Plan/SWMP is also included as part of this section or conditioned separately. The main area of possible impact is at Highridge Common

I do have some requirements as part of the materials management plan with respect to soils being used for soft landscaped areas - the areas of landscaping surrounding the road should only have soils that are suitable for the proposed end use – particularly for the Bristol section of the site as it passes

through residential areas where there is increased likelihood of children using the areas to play. We would expect the contractors to agree a sampling strategy with us for the landscaped areas.

ECONOMY, ENTERPRISE AND INCLUSION TEAM

The regeneration of South Bristol has long been a key objective for Bristol City Council. This is reflected in Core Strategy policy BCS1, which states that the area "will be a priority focus for development and comprehensive regeneration".

The Council's Economy, Enterprise and Inclusion team welcomes the applicant's proposals to deliver infrastructure that will:

- Facilitate regeneration
- Reduce congestion
- Improve accessibility to South Bristol and from there to other locations.

The team welcomes development that is estimated to support growth of 2,200 net new jobs in South Bristol by 2030. We also welcome the delivery of benefits cited in the application such as:

- Unlocking access to business markets
- Improved access to jobs in South Bristol and elsewhere in the city region
- Improved access to education and training
- Improved access to Bristol Airport
- Jobs being generated in the construction sector.

We note that the business community has been positive about the new South Bristol Link. Anecdotal evidence from dialogue the team has had with property agents suggests that investor perceptions of South Bristol are likely to become more positive following new investment in transport infrastructure, potentially unlocking development for employment generating uses.

Consequently the team has no objection to the granting of planning permission in this instance. Development should be matched to wider efforts to promote the area as a destination for investment, and skills and training programmes to help the South Bristol community benefit fully from new opportunities that it generates.

We have been asked specifically to comment on the methodology applied in the calculation of economic benefits. We are unfamiliar with the detail behind the methodology used to obtain initial jobs numbers, but the applicant argues this is based on a standard approach for identifying jobs growth benefit arising from investment in transport schemes and, specifically, improvements to connectivity. At least one previous assessment, done by Mott MacDonald, was based on an assessment of site availability and capacity to accommodate commercial development, and jobs within it.

The methodology applied to the initial jobs estimates to derive net additional and GVA benefits follows an approach that we have seen reflected in other economic impact analyses, and is in line with what we would expect.

BCC ECOLOGY

The information submitted with respect to Habitats Regulations is satisfactory but needs to be signed off by natural England.

With the exception of the proposed tree planting on Highridge Common, as this will prejudice the grassland interest of the Site of Nature Conservation Interest, the Scheme is acceptable subject to conditions covering:

Long term landscape and nature conservation plan, including the common exchange land. It is recommended that this covers a period of 25 years.

An ecological mitigation and enhancement strategy for the site to include measures to avoid impacts to legally protected and priority species. Specific measures to protect badgers during construction works

All site clearance and construction works to be carried in accordance with the Environmental Statement. Approval of details of landscaping scheme that should predominantly employ native species of local provenance.

Construction Environment Management Plan to specifically minimise the impacts on ecology generally but specifically for the Highridge Common and Colliters Brook Sites of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI).

Details for any proposed external lighting to minimise impacts on nocturnal ecology such as bats

Details of bird and bat roosting proposal, including bird and bat boxes.

The loss of a relatively small part of Highridge Common is regrettable and to achieve the mitigation a method statement should be produced for the translocation of grassland taken from Highridge Common SNCI and the translocation of hedgerows (within the scheme as a whole).

BCC SUSTAINABILITY TEAM

Many sustainability issues have been highlighted in the comments made by other consultees so these comments focus on those areas remaining unaddressed.

The Sustainability Assessment (pages 30-41 of the Sustainability Statement) is a commendable attempt to address all the sustainability issues.

That the project will achieve at least CEEQUAL Very Good is of very high importance given that, assuming planning application is granted, by the time the South Bristol Link is likely to be under construction, Bristol will be European Green Capital in 2015.

Provided the approach set out in the Sustainability Statement, particularly the "Additional sustainability recommendations," is followed through, comments can be kept minimal as to only address either what should be achieved above and beyond CEEQUAL Very Good (in certain critical areas) or what is beyond the scope of CEEQUAL. Comments are scheme-wide.

Recommendations:

- 1. Project management: CEEQUAL must continue to be used as an active tool to ensure commitments are incorporated into detailed design, contracts and then audited during and post construction.
- 2. Sustainable drainage: It is encouraging to see use of BCC flood data that factors in climate change and local factors, and the protection for 1/100 year event incorporated within the scheme.

It appears from colleagues (e.g. highways etc) that there are constraints around the use of SUDS due to alignment, space requirements of accompanying infrastructure, ground conditions, etc. For this reason more specialist suds expertise must be sought as the current input of more mainstream suds knowledge will not be aware of a great many tailored solutions and approaches that can work within these constraints and deliver multiple benefits (biodiversity, amenity, visual etc).

- 3. Materials: Agree that CEEQUAL targets for re-use and recycling of materials may not be appropriate (either too low or too high and there should be more ambitious targets than those within a Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) to be agreed in areas such as:
- Volume of materials from reclaimed or recycled material for use in the permanent works
- Volume of bulk fill and sub-base material specified and used in the project from previously used material
- Use of locally sourced materials (e.g. least distance quarry; also local character benefits) and re-cycled materials for remainder (best practice includes substituting PFA for cement)
- Replacing primary aggregates with secondary aggregates
- Very low levels of waste material generated to landfill (best practice = <1%)
- Surplus materials given to adjacent construction projects
- Coatings and treatments used were volatile organic compound free (VOC-free)

All the above areas have seen very high levels achieved on other road schemes nationally and any that fall outside the CEEQUAL framework should have targets set against national best practice.

- 4. Energy and carbon: The Sustainability Assessment mentions that a life cycle assessment has not been undertaken as the project is at the planning stage. This should be completed at the appropriate stage. Under "Additional sustainability recommendations" the Sustainability Assessment "Set ambitious emissions reduction targets for each stage". This is essential given that while achieving CEEQUAL Very Good will necessitate certain levels of achievement, given the Green Capital status of the city and the best practice standards being set nationally on materials such as:
- Incorporation of wind turbines and photovoltaic cells into structures such as lighting columns with which allow surplus renewable energy to be fed into the grid

• Specification of low energy features such as LED lighting, photocell switches and efficient fixtures and fittings for any powered systems

The PCEMP stipulates the development of a Green Travel Plan (GTP to promote travelling to/ from site using car sharing/ public transport and managing deliveries and removal of materials and equipment in an efficient and sustainable way. Local employment should also be considered (best practice >80% of subcontractors employed from the local area with proactive measurement of carbon emissions from staff travelling to and from site has been achieved).

- 5. Visible measures, such as:
- SUDS/water sensitive design and the added benefits for local biodiversity, for example use of swales designed as visible landscape feature with functions (removal of pollutants and reducing runoff rates / volume) interpreted for and encouraging landscape users
- Use of pictorial meadow planting (qv ecology)
- Infrastructure such as bus stops should be used as a tool to communicate environmental issues: green roofs and solar PV to be considered (it is recognised that PV panels will not be appropriate in all locations due to potential damage).
- 6. Infrastructure: All new infrastructure in and around the city should be provided in consultation with BCC Smart and Future City, and Energy teams to ensure that they are as flexible and "ready" as possible for future District Heating and Information and Communications Technology infrastructure, to avoid the additional financial and environmental costs associated with future works to the road.

BCC CITY DESIGN GROUP

Whole scheme general comments

For most parts of the scheme a further level of landscape detail will be needed which will be described in the text below for the various sections of the road. This detail may be conditioned if planning permission is granted.

The landscape proposals should show existing trees to be removed and a detailed tree survey is needed.

Consider the idea of planting single or groups of characterful trees such as pines next to bus stops to help to visually locate bus stops.

The cycle/footpath mainly runs along the side of the road. This is a lost opportunity to allow cyclist and pedestrians a route away from motorised vehicles similar to the Festival Way cycle track.

Landscape design principles needed for detentions basins. Should not be over engineered and a naturalistic green engineering approach is welcome to promote wildlife and enhance visual amenity.

A well-funded, robust planting and maintenance specification is needed to ensure trees thrive and become well established in the first five years after planting.

Looking for a principle of minimum signage and reduction of clutter to enhance the street scene.

Highridge Common and Green

Need to ensure a sympathetic hard and soft landscape treatment along the Highridge Common stretch of the road that respects and enhances its character and is not over engineered. Further landscape detail needed to show that this has been considered.

- Avoidance of up-stand kerb on the side of the common
- Visually 'softer' road surface finish
- Conservation quality hard materials especially kerb lines (preferably natural stone
- Minimal countryside style signage and bus stop design
- Careful consideration of lighting column style
- Yellow lining for conservation area

King Georges Road

Need to ensure a sympathetic hard and soft landscape treatment along the Highridge Common stretch of the road that respects and enhances its character and is not over engineered. Further landscape detail needed to show that this has been considered.

- Avoidance of up-stand kerb on the side of the common
- Visually 'softer' road surface finish
- Conservation quality hard materials especially kerb lines (preferably natural stone
- Minimal countryside style signage and bus stop design
- Careful consideration of lighting column style
- Yellow lining for conservation area

Queens Road to Heggard Close

Retain and enhance the informal naturalistic style of the planting where possible ensuring road alignment allows for optimum boundary planting.

- Query extent and design of noise barrier
- Query the potential for further planning in relation to bus stop and Redhouse Office car park

Heggard Close to Hareclive Road

Strengthening of the landscape structure would be welcome mainly in terms of tree planting. Serious consideration of well-funded, long-term and sustainable landscape maintenance & management is needed taking into account the limited resources currently available to Bristol City Council.

- Seek opportunities for further tree planting
- Query rationale for shrub planting and encourage its omission to retain openness

- Request the reintroduction of confident floral rich swards and seasonal bulb planting
- Examine boundary treatments in detail looking to replace exiting dilapidated fences and ensuring sufficient and appropriate boundary planting.
- Query the need for carriageway separation and whether this approach could better benefit separation of cycle/foot path from road
- Check detail planting related to adjacent play areas
- Looking for detailed proposals for subtle land formation and modelling

Hareclive Road to Cater Road roundabout

A strengthening of the landscape structure would be welcome. Serious consideration of well-funded, long-term and sustainable landscape maintenance & management is needed taking into account the limited resources currently available to Bristol City Council.

- Seek formal tree planting either side of Whitchurch Lane and along Whitland Road
- Query rationale for shrub planting and encourage its omission to retain openness
- Request the reintroduction of confident floral rich swards and seasonal bulb planting
- Need detail of the design and long-term sustainable maintenance/management of the detention basins
- Looking for detailed proposals for subtle land formation and modelling

BCC HEALTHY URBAN TEAM

The current plans are an improvement on the early ones and we are pleased that many of the comments Public Health made earlier have been responded to. However, not all of them have been.

Public Health Bristol strongly supports the development of public transport services, and improved infrastructure for walking and cycling that the South Bristol Link will bring. It is essential for the health and wellbeing of Bristol residents that we develop travel and transport facilities and routes that enable Bristol residents to access their workplaces, schools, local services, retail outlets, leisure opportunities, friends and family by means of public transport combined with walking and/or cycling.

Travel and transport arrangements must also be designed in such a way that they assist the regeneration of the deprived areas of South Bristol, and they must help to enable Bristol as a City to meet its carbon reduction targets and develop resilience against the impacts of declining supplies of cheap oil and of the economic consequences of Peak Oil.

Bristol will be European Green Capital in 2015 when the South Bristol Link, assuming it gets planning application, is likely to be under construction. Therefore we should be aiming to make it an exemplar scheme in terms of maximising the potential positive health impacts and minimising the negative impacts. There are a number of improvements that could be made for a relatively limited cost that would make significant improvements.

A Health Impact Assessment has been incorporated in the Environmental Impact Assessment (chap 2.12). The overall methodology appears robust. The rationale and objectives for the scheme are clearly defined. Both phases of the scheme, construction and operation, have been assessed. However, the recommendations of the HIA are not identified as clearly as they could be, nor how they are all addressed within the planning application. There are a few omissions that are detailed in the comments below.

Scheme wide recommendations:

 A noise insulation programme to be set out in a Section 106 agreement and to be implemented prior to the opening of the South Bristol Link.[Noise is considered in Key Issue D]
 A condition be applied that details of a funded programme of traffic management and environmental improvement measures on Kings Head Lane, Highridge Green, Whitchurch Road, Bishopsworth Road, South Liberty Lane, Parson Street gyratory and Winterstoke Road be submitted to the Local Planning Authority prior to the opening of the South Bristol Link. Implementation of the traffic management and environmental improvement measures to commence immediately after the opening of the South Bristol Link with the aim of locking-in the benefits of the reductions in traffic on these roads [This issue is considered in Key Issue C]

3. The recommendations set out the health impact assessment (EIA section 2.12 that cover matters such as environmental controls, local work force targets etc) be implemented through a Section 106 agreement. [A Construction Environmental Management Plan will be used to during the construction period, other matters are considered in Key Issue H]

4. 20mph limit.[Key Issue C]

5. Where a median strip is proposed should be designed with changes of surface and trees.[This will be assessed when detailed drawings are submitted for approval]

6. Provision of a two-way cycle route running south of the South Bristol Link and where possible the footway and cycleway should be segregated. [Adequacy of cycle provision considered in Key issue C]

7. South Liberty Lane/AVTM link junction: provide a more direct cycle route to South Liberty Lane.[NSC agreed to this]

8. King Georges Road: Do not widen the carriageway in order to help keep speeds down; south side should be widened to allow cycle use; path outside 84-86 St George's Road should cut the corner off [Adequacy of highway design is considered in Key Issue C and E]

9. Reserve corridor: south side should be widened to allow cycle use[Adequacy of cycle provision considered in Key issue C]; not all noise sensitive receptors been identified (eg Gatehouse Centre) [This is correct but the assessment includes worse case impacts and is considered to be sufficient to assess impacts]

10. Highclive Road to Cater Road roundabout: shared cycle/footpath should be provided to connect the SBL route to Crox Bottom cycle path as this will then provide a connected route between Malago Greenway, SBL and Festival Way; cyclists on Whitland Road should be connected to the SBL path (eg a direct link to the new crossing near Lidl; [Agree and a condition is proposed to require local amendments to the scheme to secure better connections in this area}

11 Cater Road roundabout and eastwards: there are no proposals to visually improve this area and make it more attractive to cyclists and pedestrian such as replacing roundabout with a light controlled crossing, reducing dual carriageway to single carriageway[The scheme being considered does stop at the roundabout and whilst it would be desirable to see enhancements to the existing highway further to the east beyond the planning application site this is not considered necessary to make the proposal acceptable]

BCC ARCHAEOLOGY

Since much of the route within Bristol runs along existing roads, there are no major archaeological issues. The principal impact upon a known heritage asset is at Highridge Common, possibly once a larger parcel of land subsequently encroached upon. It is possible that the works could encounter remains associated with Redhous Farm near the junction with Hareclive Road and there could be archaeological interest near the Queens Road junction.

The Heritage Statement is correct in suggesting a precautionary programme of geophysical survey and, if necessary, subsequent excavation as mitigation for any adverse impact upon as yet unknown sites. This approach can be covered by conditions.

BCC TREE OFFICER

The proposals will result in the removal of 25 individual trees (20 low value, 5 moderate value), part of 4 tree groups (c. 68 m2) and part of two hedges (c. 156 m2) from the area of the development within the Bristol City boundary. 1.4. The most significant arboricultural impact will be on King Georges Road but the development does offer the opportunity to replant the whole avenue for longer-term benefit.

I am therefore not opposed to the removal of the trees provided that suitable compensation planting is provided, and the intention to replant 172 trees, mostly along King Georges Road and the reserve corridor is favourable. It is appropriate to plant more than the 93 required by the tree replacement policy because the scheme itself justifies additional planting.

However there is currently little detail of species and size and concern in a few areas that retained trees may not survive the construction process. Also there are doubts about the feasibility of planting

along King Georges Road due to underground services and I would like to see trail pits dug and the feasibility of tree planting established before permission is granted. I also query whether the spacing of trees along KGR is too close to enable medium/large trees (that are appropriate) to achieve maturity and whether they are safe from parking on the verge.

I query planting on Highridge Common as this will impact the grass land habitat and not in character with the common. I suggest planting is moved to the strips of amenity grass land on the east side.

Clarity about long term maintenance is required as is a tree protection plan during construction.

RESPONSES FROM EXTERNAL CONSULTEES

NETWORK RAIL

- Network Rail will be delivering the bridge on behalf of North Somerset Council and has no comments to make.

NATURAL ENGLAND

- No objection relating to habitat regulations, SSSI and Protected Species, subject to conditions to deal with preparation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan and a Post-construction Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan.
- Expectation that the Local Planning Authority fully assesses local impacts and consider securing enhanced biodiversity.

ENGLISH HERITAGE

- The application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of your expert conservation advice.

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY

- No objection subject to conditions relating to flood compensation, details of surface water drainage, details of the highway crossing over the Malago culvert, a full operation and maintenance strategy for the proposed drainage and flood risk management features, a remediation strategy for dealing with the discovery of any unexpected contamination, a Construction Environmental Management Plan.
- Advices recommended to cover Water Resources Act 1991 and the Land Drainage Act 1991.

WESSEX WATER

- No objection in principle.

BRISTOL WATER

- No objection but further dialogue is required with the council's highway departments to assess impacts on water mains.

POLICE TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT UNIT

- Concerns expressed regarding the proposed prohibition of movement at junctions Highridge Road, Queens Road and Hareclive Road – as these are not physically prevented by engineering and concerns regarding the level of compliance with the proposed restrictions. Lack of compliance would give rise to road safety issues and require an unsustainable level of enforcement to promote compliance.
- Concerns regarding road safety due to the relationship of the property 83 Highridge Road with the proposed junction at Highridge Road as the access from/to the existing property is shown as being unregulated and into the junction, outside the confines of the pedestrian crossing and signals.

CRIME PREVENTION DESIGN ADVISOR

- The route for pedestrian, cycles and vehicles should not be segregated from one another. The proposed footpath/cycle route should not run to the rear of and provide access to gardens, rear yards or dwellings as these have proved to be crime generators.

Routes should be; As straight as possible, a wide footpath (at least 3 metres with a 2 metre verge either side), well lit the whole length, devoid of potential hiding places, overlooked by surrounding buildings and activities, planting close to the path must be low to avoid hiding places, with a maintenance management scheme in place.

RELEVANT POLICIES

National Planning Policy Framework – March 2012

Bristol Local Plan, Adopted December 1997

B2	Local	Context	

- B5 Layout and Form
- B15 Streets and Open Space
- B22 Sites of Archaeological Significance
- EC2 Promoting Growth: Industry and Warehousing
- EC3 Promoting Growth: B1 Development
- M1 Transport Development Control Criteria
- M16 Cycling and Pedestrians
- M19 Highway Network: New Roads Environmental and Economic Effects
- M20 Highway Network: Improvements to the Primary Road Network
- ME2 Location and Design of Developments
- ME4 Controlling the Impact of Noise
- ME5 Protection of Groundwater Supplies
- ME10 Development Adjacent to Rivers and watercourses
- NE1 Open Space
- L3 Greenways: Walking and Cycling
- NE3 Trees and Woodlands (including tree planting and the Community Forest)
- NE5 Sites of Nature Conservation Interest
- NE11 New Development: Natural Environment Considerations
- NE13 Green Belt: Boundary

Bristol Core Strategy (Adopted June 2011)

- BCS1 South Bristol
- BCS5 Housing Provision

- BCS6 Green Belt
- BCS8 Delivering a Thriving Economy
- BCS9 Green Infrastructure
- BCS10 Transport and Access Improvements
- BCS11 Infrastructure and Developer Contributions
- BCS13 Climate Change
- BCS14 Sustainable Energy
- BCS15 Sustainable Design and Construction
- BCS16 Flood Risk and Water Management
- BCS21 Quality Urban Design
- BCS22 Conservation and the Historic Environment
- BCS23 Pollution

Bristol Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (emerging)

- DM1 Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- DM14 The health impacts of development
- DM15 Green infrastructure provision
- DM17 Development involving existing green infrastructure
- DM19 Development and nature conservation
- DM23 Transport development management
- DM26 Local character and distinctiveness
- DM27 Layout and form
- DM28 Public realm
- DM31 Heritage assets
- DM33 Pollution control, air quality and water quality
- DM34 Contaminated land
- DM35 Noise mitigation
- DM22 Development adjacent to waterways

Supplementary Planning Documents

- SPD5 Sustainable Design and Construction (February 2006)
- SPD7 Archaeology and Development (March 2006)

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- PAN 14 Safety and Security (1997)
- PAN 15 Responding to Local Character a Design Guide (1998)
- PPS10 Planning for Sustainable Waste Management (July 2005)
- PAN 1 Residential Guidelines (November 1993)

KEY ISSUES

A.IS THE PRINCIPLE OF SBL SUPPORTED?

Policy BCS10 in the Core Strategy sets out clear support for SBL alongside other improvements to transport infrastructure, in order to provide an integrated transport system which improves accessibility within Bristol and supports growth through proposed levels of development. The Core Strategy describes SBL as a "transport link between the A370 and the A4174 Hengrove Roundabout to enable better access to south Bristol". The support in this policy is subject to environmental assessment and key issues below assess the main environmental effects of the scheme.

It is also material that the SBL is part of a wider transport package for the West of England subregion, which, for the Bristol built up area, also comprises the North Fringe to Hengrove MetroBus route (NFHP) and the Ashton Vale to Temple Meads MetroBus (AVTM). Together the three linked

schemes represent a significant investment in transport infrastructure to promote and support growth in population and the economy by providing a more integrated transport network for the sub-region.

The SBL component of this wider scheme is designed to improve accessibility to employment areas in south Bristol, a sub-regional focus for regeneration, and to provide businesses and residents with better connectivity to the remainder of the sub-region and its strategic transport network. The AVTM MetroBus scheme will combine with the SBL bus only link and SBL through the urban area to provide a route for a new service to Hengrove Park. It is proposed that every third service on the AVTM route will continue to Hengrove Park using SBL. Also the bus only link forming part of SBL will give additional bus priority for the Bristol Airport to Bristol city centre route and in particular increase journey time reliability.

There has been a long held aspiration to create this new highway link but SBL scheme has its more recent justification within the Greater Bristol Strategic Transport Study (GBSTS) produced in 2006, which identified a programme of necessary transport interventions to ensure sustainable growth and development of the West of England. This resulted in the SBL being identified in the West of England Joint Local Transport Plan in 2007.

Policy BCS11 states that "Development and Infrastructure will be coordinated to ensure that growth in the city is supported by the provision of infrastructure, services and facilities needed to maintain and improve quality of life and respond to the needs of the local economy".

Policy BCS1 sets out that south Bristol will be a focus for development and regeneration .It identifies, amongst other matters, growth in office, industrial and residential development. Knowle West and Hengrove Park are identified as two particular major regeneration locations. The policy recognises that SBL is only one part of a package of improvements or transport infrastructure that will include rapid transport proposals (such as the planned North Fringe to Hengrove MetroBus route), extended show case bus routes and safe routes for pedestians and cyclists.

Saved BLP policies EC2, EC3 and H2 identify sites developed for business and housing growth that will be superseded in due course by sites identified in the DM&SA policy to achieve the higher levels of growth set out in the BCS.

The diagrammatic alignment of SBL is show on the key diagram in the BCS running from Hengrove roundabout and into NSC area via Highridge Common. This is consistent with the alignment set out on the BLP proposals map (referred to then as part of the Avon Ring Road within BLP policy M20). The same corridor is now safeguarded for SBL in the DM&SA policy DM24.

BLP policy M19 requires major road proposals to have regard to an assessment of environmental implications, an evaluation of appropriate alternative options and consultation with the public and other interests considerations.

Notwithstanding the clear support in principle for SBL in policies BCS10 and BLP M19, both require environmental assessment of the scheme. In any event the scheme requires assessment under other policies that deal with environmental impact and key issues below deal with matters including traffic impact, noise, air quality and visual impact. This planning application is accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment.

Consultation on the planning application by the LPA has been carried out in accordance with normal requirements but importantly the applicant has carried out a full process of public consultation as

more fully set out above. Early stages of consultation by BCC and NSC as promoters in 2008 and 2009 considered the principles of the scheme and options for the alignment of the route corridor. Prior to that stage, options for transport proposals in south Bristol had been considered as part of several studies since 1992 including The South Bristol Transport Study-Review of Schemes (HalcrowFox 1997) and A38-A370Link Road Study(JMP 2002). The requirements of BLP policy M19 in respect of consultation and options assessment are, therefore, considered to be met.

The economic benefits of the scheme are important to the policy support for SBL. The application is supported by an Economic Benefits Study that sets out the purpose of SBL to facilitate regeneration and growth in south Bristol, reduce congestion in south Bristol and adjacent areas of North Somerset and improve accessibility from south Bristol to the city centre and to strategic transport links, including the trunk road network and Bristol International Airport. The study highlights that the south Bristol area suffers from low levels of economic activity, low skill levels and high levels of unemployment which, combined with significant out-commuting, have contributed to acute deprivation. Additionally, a review of existing studies showed that transport is a major barrier to economic growth in south Bristol, and that investment in the proposed scheme will play a key role in unlocking new growth.

A number of consultation responses have challenged the economic predications for SBL. Consultees query the assumption that better access will lead to regeneration and better economic prospects for businesses and residents of South Bristol. Furthermore they consider that the predictions for journey time savings for general traffic and public transport are small and in any event based on flawed traffic predictions. For example objectors to the scheme challenge the applicant's prediction that the by 2030, 2500 jobs in south Bristol will be unlocked by the construction of SBL.

In summary, the applicant has set out its response to the main criticisms to the economic case as follows:

- The Economic Benefits study forming part of the Environmental statement includes a business survey. In response to questions about the most important factor for business performance, factors that may enable growth and factors important for relocation decisions, improved transport links/transport links to customers where sited as the most important.eg 62% of businesses said it would benefit their business, listing improved journey speed and accessibility to customers as the main benefits
- The economic justification including the value to be attributed to predicted time savings is based on Department of Transport criteria used to support the business case for central government funding and is, therefore, robust.
- Although the economic case has been based on 2009 traffic surveys, and there has been a lower than expected growth in traffic since then, due to the effects of the recession. The scheme should not be assessed against shorter term fluctuations in levels of growth but against longer term factors including expected population growth, car ownership, GDP and fuel prices which are key drivers of the growth in demand for travel which continue to be largely in line with the forecasts which have informed the appraisal.
- The assumptions behind the estimation of employment impacts are clearly stated in the SBL Economic Benefits report. The starting point for the estimation of SBL's employment impacts was the LEP's vision for the long-term transformation of south Bristol and the creation of 10,000 new jobs in the area. The rationale for using the LEP's vision as the starting point for the assessment of the economic impacts of SBL is because SBL is embedded and driven by

West of England objectives for transport solutions and regeneration in south Bristol. The unlocking effect of SBL was based on the percentage of the 10,000 jobs that could be delivered with and without SBL, with the unlocking effect being the difference between the two scenarios

Objectors to the scheme nevertheless challenge the claimed economic benefits from the scheme. Your officers consider that the predictions for the levels of new jobs or economic activity put forward by the applicant cannot be taken at face value as there is no totally reliable method of predicting such outcomes. The scheme has used recognised methods for assessing economic impacts as part of the business case to government.

The challenges to these predicted outcomes should be weighed alongside the high level of support for the scheme from business and other interests Including Business West, University of the West of England, Cater Road Business Park and a significant number of the many individual businesses that have written in support of the scheme. Their view is that this investment in transport infrastructure is long overdue and required to support enterprise and business confidence.

One aspect of the economic potential of the proposal is the opportunities offered by the construction stage for local employment and trading, associated with this £43m scheme. It is normal for major schemes to enter into a S106 agreement with developers to secure local training opportunities eg to secure a target for apprenticeship schemes. Because the council is the applicant it is not possible to secure such an obligation through a planning agreement, but there is a commitment to consider this subject to compliance with employment and procurement legislation. It is also relevant that the council is involved in any event with other initiatives to improve access to employment and training.

In conclusion, the principle and proposed corridor of SBL is firmly supported by the development plan . The scheme is reflected in up to date policy and follows strategic reviews of the scheme leading to its inclusion in the West of England Joint Local Transport Plan in 2007. Underpinning the proposal is the access and economic benefits it will bring to south Bristol in particular but also to the wider sub region such as better access to the airport and the proposal being part of a wider network of transport infrastructure for the greater Bristol area. The challenges to the economic and transport benefits predictions by some objectors have to be weighed against the very strong policy basis, particularly BCS1 and BCS10 and the significant level of support for SBL from business organisations, individual businesses and some residents. It is considered, therefore that the principle of SBL should be supported and very significant weight should be attached to this aspect of the assessment.

B. IS SBL ACCEPTABLE IN THAT PART OF THE SITE DESIGNATED AS GREEN BELT?

The section of SBL at Highridge Common is in the Green Belt.

BCS6 states that the Green Belt will be protected from so called "inappropriate" development. NPPF is the source of advice for defining if development is to be regarded as "inappropriate" in this context. Paragraphs 79 to 92 of the NPPF deal with protecting Green Belt land. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl and to safeguard the countryside by keeping land permanently open. The NPPF at paragraph 80 confirms that the Green Belt serves 5 purposes, bulleted below.

The guidance within the NPPF (paragraph 87) goes on to outline that "inappropriate" development is that which is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in 'very special circumstances'. Paragraph 88 recommends that when considering planning applications, Local Planning Authorities should ensure that "substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt.

'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations."

Certain forms of development are however deemed not to be "inappropriate" development in the Green Belt provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. NPPF includes amongst these forms of development "local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location."

In relation to the section of SBL at Highridge it is considered that it will preserve the openness because it will be constructed at or close to existing ground levels. There will be a clear visual impact at the common from the widening of the existing road (Highridge Green) and construction of a new road across the common but it is not considered that the openness of this part of the green Belt will be harmed as a result.

In relation to the 5 purposes of the green belt the impact of the Bristol section of SBL is judged by your officers to be as follows:

- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas: the scale and nature of the works, that do not include any significant vertical elements except for street furniture, would not contribute to urban sprawl.
- to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another: the issue in this part of the Bristol urban fringe is concern about the merging of Bristol with Long Ashton and due to the nature of the works and their location it is considered the SBL in Bristol will not lead to merging of these settlements.
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment: this test is considered to be similar to the consideration of the impact on openness and urban sprawl and it is not considered that the section of road at the common of itself would lead to encroachment of the countryside.
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns: whilst Bristol is an historic town this part Bristol is characterised by 20th century suburban housing, although there are a few older properties near to the common. It is considered therefore that this purpose of the green belt in this location is not harmed.
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land: one of the purposes of the SBL is to assist urban regeneration, particularly in south Bristol by improving transport links. Therefore SBL supports this purpose of the green belt.

It is considered therefore that SBL in Bristol does not harm the 5 purposes of the green belt. However, to be not "inappropriate" development, SBL must also demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location.

Supporting information submitted with the application sets out a brief history leading to this route selection. The detailed alignment and format of the proposed development has been subject to a rigorous options appraisal process, commencing in 1992 with the Avon Ring Road Options Report (MVA, 1992) and has included options appraisal in 2008 and public consultation in 2009 and 2010. The 'South Bristol Link, Options Appraisal Summary Report' (Atkins, November 2012) details the full options appraisal process that has led to the chosen scheme and its alignment partly within the Green

Belt. The options appraisal process culminated in the preparation of the Major Scheme Business Case (MSBC) which identified local objectives, confirmed the scheme options and appraised the scheme against DfT guidance. Two options appraisal workshops were undertaken in 2009 to identify and appraise options against a set of agreed objectives which were to:

- facilitate regeneration and growth in south Bristol;
- reduce congestion in south Bristol and adjacent areas of north Somerset; and
- improve accessibility from south Bristol to the City Centre and strategic transport links.

This options appraisal process led to an alignment being taken forward to the MSBC and then an amended scheme taken to the Best and Final Bid (BAFB) stage. The options appraisal process has identified and formally tested a large number of alignments and the one selected is considered the most appropriate with the least environmental impact in comparison with the alternatives.

It is considered that this options appraisal process provides justification for the requirement for the development in the Green Belt in order to achieve the objectives set.

It is your officers view that the SBL within the Bristol section of the planning application is not "inappropriate" development and, therefore, it is acceptable in principle. However the applicant has submitted additional information setting out a case that even if it is deemed that SBL is "inappropriate" development in the green belt there are, in any event, very special circumstances which would clearly outweigh any harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm. In summary, these are the economic benefits of the scheme arising out this transport investment as considered in Key Issue A above. This transport investment is aimed in particular at helping to unlock the economic potential of south Bristol, with its higher levels of social and economic challenges, and supporting the development growth identified in the BCS.

The proposed routing of SBL, in order to connect south Bristol with the A38 and A370, has been subject to a process of option review by the applicant over the last few years. It is of note that all routes that make this link would be within the Green Belt, including the bus only link that will connect the AVTM Metro Bus route to the SBL. There are, therefore, no alternative routes that do not involve green belt land to achieve the scheme. The selected corridor through the green belt following the option review is shown in the adopted BCS and emerging Site Allocation and Development Management Policies (SA &DM).

In conclusion, it is considered that SBL is not "inappropriate" development and, therefore, acceptable in principle in the green belt. Even if it was concluded that the development is "inappropriate" then it is considered that there are very special circumstances to justify this green belt development.

C. ARE THE TRAFFIC, TRAVEL AND ACCESS IMPLICATIONS ACCEPTABLE?

The traffic impact of the proposal is an aspects of the environmental assessment of this scheme as required by BCS 10. This policy also sets down the priority that should be given to different road users in assessing development proposals but it is also clearly stated in this policy that this priority (with the top three being pedestrians, cyclists, public transport) should not be applied in such a way that it would prejudice the implementation of the major transport schemes such as SBL. In other words the policy recognises that the design of the scheme will need to strike an appropriate balance between the strategic needs of the scheme and the needs of priority groups recognised in this policy.

BLP policy M1 and emerging replacement policy DM23 within the SA& DM provide a more detailed list of criteria for matters to be considered .Relevant aspects of M1 for this proposal for SBL are:

(i) It safeguards transport proposals, as shown on the Proposals Map;

(ii) It provides safe and adequate access on to the existing highway network having

regard to environmental considerations.

(iii) It avoids the introduction of traffic of excessive volume, size or weight on to

unsuitable highways or into residential and other environmentally sensitive

areas;

(v) It provides facilities for cyclists and pedestrians;

(vi) It provides traffic calming measures;

(vii) It provides funding of appropriate transport improvements to overcome

unsatisfactory transport conditions created or exacerbated as a direct result

of the development;

(viii) It does not increase the need to travel and does not encourage the

unnecessary use of cars or lorries.

(xi) It avoids the introduction of unnecessary lorry traffic into the city centre or

where environmental quality would be harmed or congestion increased.

As for BCS10, the policy recognises the need to balance the delivery of transport proposals (criteria (i) against other considerations. In any event this policy needs to be used in combination with BCS10 that supports significant improvement to transport infrastructure.

BLP policy M16 seeks to take opportunities to enhance cycling and pedestrian networks.

This part of the assessment deals first with an assessment of the adequacy of the Transport Assessment (TA) submitted with the application. It then describes first the main traffic impacts to the wider network and then looks at detailed impacts to particular parts of the network including on SBL itself. Scheme design matters are then considered include speed limits, pedestrian and cycle access, public rights of way, public transport and traffic management matters.

A number of detailed comments have been received from individual residents and businesses as reported in the Response to consultation section above. Where possible responses to these have been dealt with alongside those comments.

Rationale behind the transport Assessment

For the submitted TA to be considered acceptable to BCC officers, there are two broad areas of quantitative analysis that are required to reflect the impact and effects, in transport terms, of the proposal both in the wider area and locally. These are included with the submission.

This first involves a strategic transport modelling exercise that forecasts the change in future-year transport patterns and routing that arise on the wider road network as a direct result of the development, in comparison with the parallel situation if the SBL was not built.

The second piece of analysis relates to a more detailed testing of key locations on the network, in terms of how individual junctions are designed and forecasted to operate as a result of the new road link and the design of its associated new measures. The scope of assessment to be contained within the TA was agreed between BCC officers and the project team, in conjunction with NSC counterparts during 2012.

Wider Area (Strategic) Modelling Rationale

The transport impacts and interactions associated with major highway schemes are complex and have a wide area of influence. As such, the use of an area-wide multi-modal strategic transport modelling tool is necessary. The model used to forecast the impacts of this development has been specifically designed to enable future-year forecasts to be carried out concerning patterns of movement.

The strategic modelling tool used in this instance calculates the cost and patterns of demand for travel and relates this to the supply of options for travel (i.e. network capacity / public transport options) at any given time. How these factors change as a result of variations in population, housing growth and economic activity are also taken into account. Where major investment or infrastructure is planned, it is necessary to utilise this strategic modelling to enable future year forecasts to be made. In this case, the supporting assessment work relates to an opening (design) year of 2016, and a future forecast year of 2031. The later year represents the end of the current period for which key local land-use planning policies are targeted.

In taking into account the above, the following outputs are forecasted by the strategic model:

- Vehicle Movements
- Origin and Destination of trips
- Routing patterns
- Congestion and Delay
- Public Transport-based Movements

The above modelling was conducted using industry-standard SATURN software in conjunction with a Public Transport Assignment Model (PTAM) and a multi-modal incremental demand model.

Strategic Model Validation

Any modelling work must be demonstrated to adequately represent the existing highway situation before it can provide a realistic forecast of future year scenarios. In order for the model to be demonstrated as fit for purpose further scrutiny was required of the model used to assess the impact of the proposals.

The SBL model was derived from core modelling that was approved by the DfT as part of the Best and Final Funding Bid (BFFB) for transport infrastructure in 2011. Following this, the baseline

assessment was updated to reflect current traffic levels following an extensive remit of survey work in 2012.

Subsequent to the above, a Local Model Validation Report (LMVR) was prepared in 2013. This method of reporting the accuracy of transport models is standard practice. The LMVR identified that the 2012 baseline model met the appropriate DfT criteria for validation in the South Bristol area. The LMVR did however suggest that further sensitivity tests should be undertaken concerning the forecast flows for the 2016 opening year peak and inter-peak periods. These tests were subsequently undertaken, which found the model to continue to accurately reflect the observed travel patterns and associated vehicle journey times. As a result, highway officers are content that the construction and operation of the model allows for a robust strategic assessment of the proposals to be made.

In summary, therefore, the impact of the proposed SBL upon traffic movement has been established following a detailed transport modelling analysis. In relation to the reliability of the strategic modelling submitted, officers have scrutinised how well the model validates and in common with the findings of an audit of the model against DfT requirements are satisfied that this provides a satisfactory basis upon which to make forecasts to better understand the changes brought about by the construction of SBL. The need to forecast both localised and wider impacts has been met and this has been carried out in line with the 2007 DfT Guidance on Transport Assessment, against which all TA reports are required to comply with.

Local Network (Junction) Modelling

It is also necessary to investigate how the design of new junctions would affect the operation of the SBL as well as local roads. This level of modelling has particular regard to how factors such as junction geometry, turning bans, pedestrian / cycle facilities and signal configuration contribute towards the impacts of the scheme. The Transport Assessment submitted with the application includes operational assessments of all new junctions that are formed by the new link road using industry-standard LINSIG and ARCADY modelling. Highway officers are content that this detailed modelling has been carried out and validated to a suitable degree of accuracy upon which to base recommendations to members.

Transport Assessment (TA) Findings

In the case of both the strategic and local models, corresponding assessment runs were undertaken for the 'with development' scenarios in the 2016 opening year and 2031 future year for the AM peak & PM peak hour scenarios. For the purposes of net comparison, the strategic model has also considered the operation of the wider network in the event that the SBL is not delivered. A summary of the various outputs from the TA that have been considered by highway officers when determining this application is provided below.

- Existing Traffic Conditions;
- Existing Public Transport, Walking and Cycling networks;
- Impact of SBL construction;
- Impact of SBL, including:
- o change in peak hour flows and routing along specific links

- o link and junction capacity analysis
- o journey time analysis
- o impact of the scheme upon walking, cycling and public transport networks

In order to adequately assess the effects of the proposed SBL, highway officers have first concentrated upon how the availability of additional highway network capacity has been forecasted by the SATURN model to influence the peak hour routing patterns of vehicles, and how this change in routing patterns has affected the forecasted flow of traffic in a number of key areas.

The strategic modelling has taken into account as committed the delivery of planned local public transport infrastructure, including the Ashton Vale – Temple Meads (AVTM) MetroBus route. It should be noted that the Transport and Works Order for the AVTM route has recently gained Secretary of State approval, and this has taken account of more recent proposed changes to the route in the city centre. The implications of the route adjustments in the city centre area upon bus routes travelling along SBL is not considered by officers, or the DfT to generate a significant impact upon the feasibility or reliability of such services.

Supporting Documents to this report include tables and diagrams showing the forecasted change in traffic flows across key locations on the local highway network for the opening (design) year of 2016 and for the future year of 2031 for the AM and PM peak periods.

Forecasted reductions in traffic

A number of locations are forecast to experience a reduction in traffic volumes in all scenarios tested as a result of the construction of SBL. In comparison with the forecast scenario without SBL, reductions in the volume of two-way traffic are forecasted along Whitchurch Lane, Church Road, Grange Road, Gatehouse Avenue, Bishopsworth Road, Bedminster Down Road, Kings Head Lane, Bridgwater Road, Highridge Green (in the vicinity of Sandburows Road) and Highridge Road. One of the main benefits will be on Kings Head Lane where a reduction from 800 to 390 vehicles is predicted during the morning peak hour flow in 2016.

Further afield from the route of SBL and as a result of motorists adopting revised route choices from presently owing to changes in highway capacity, varying reductions in two-way traffic are also forecasted along more strategic routes, including Hartcliffe Way, Parson Street gyratory system, East Street, Bedminster Parade, Winterstoke Road, Ashton Drive, Cumberland Road, Coronation Road and Clift House Road.

Some objectors query the benefits of these reductions, predicting this relieved roads will just fill up with more traffic .However, reductions in traffic on roads are predicted at least to the design year of 2031, a period of 15 years following anticipated opening of SBL, even without any measures to lock in these benefits. Proposed strategic and local initiatives over this period are aimed at achieving modal shift (such as investment in public transport, 20mph zones and residents parking schemes) and these are expected to contribute to consolidating reductions in traffic during this period and beyond. In addition, the reduction in traffic on these roads, especially residential streets, provides the opportunity for traffic calming and capacity reductions and the priority for such schemes would be considered by Bristol City Council as part of the (it's) assessment of minor highway schemes through the Neighbourhood Partnerships.

Forecasted increases in traffic

The most significant increases in traffic along existing major routes are forecasted to occur along the A370 to the north of the SBL and the A38 Bridgwater Road to the south of the SBL in both the morning and evening peak hours in 2016 and 2031. The impact of increased flows on the A370 is considered later. It is also noted that in the 2031 PM peak hour, increases in traffic are forecasted along the A4174 Hengrove Way, which is partly attributable to identified housing growth in south Bristol in the period to 2031.

The most significant increase in traffic elsewhere is forecasted along King George's Road and the southern end of Highridge Green. For example, the predicted morning peak hour two way flow will increase from 160 vehicles to 1280 In order to provide a local comparison and a sense of this impact, Whitchurch Lane currently carries 1980 so the level on King Georges Road will be approximately 65% of this level. With SBL in place the level on Whitchurch Lane is predicted to decrease to 1100.

Forecasted re-routing of traffic

In order to understand more about the traffic that is forecasted to use SBL and from where it has rerouted, Highway Officers have considered and queried the Select Link Analysis (SLA) modelling presented as part of the TA. SLA runs are able to determine, on a given link, the origin and destination of vehicles forecasted to travel along it when comparing the with SBL and without SBL scenarios. The analysis presented within the TA indicates that of the forecast traffic using SBL in the 2016 peak hours, much of it has transferred from two key current routing patterns. These are: firstly, during the morning peak hour, traffic using the A38 Bridgwater Road or Bishopsworth Road to access Winterstoke Rd or West Street via Parson Street gyratory; and secondly, the east-west routing that currently occurs via Highridge Green or Whitchurch Lane to access Bridgwater Road via Church Road and Kings Head Lane. These patterns are forecasted to be broadly reversed (in direction) during the evening peak hours.

These findings indicate that at the design year of 2016, traffic using SBL is forecast to enter the Bristol urban area by the A370 in favour of using the A38 to the north of the SBL in view of the additional network capacity that is provided along SBL and at its junctions with the A38 and A370. This behaviour is forecasted to be repeated when the outputs for the 2031 peak hour scenarios are considered.

In summary, of the forecasted impact upon routing, the construction of SBL is predicted in both the design and future year scenarios to result in a significant shift in motorist behaviour across south west Bristol, where traffic has been demonstrated through the modelling to be relocated from minor roads onto SBL and other more strategic and appropriate routes that are engineered specifically to carry large volumes of traffic. The exceptions to this are King George's Road and the southern end of Highridge Green, which by virtue of becoming part of SBL are proposed to be significantly improved from their current specification to include appropriate signal control, public transport provision and safe pedestrian / cycle facilities in response to the increase in demand for all movements, as discussed later.

Detailed Matters of Highway Network Impact

Winterstoke Road

The above analysis forecasts a reduction in demand along Winterstoke Road following the construction of SBL during all but one of the four peak hour periods tested. However, whilst a significant reduction forecasted for the 2016 PM period, modest reductions are forecast in all other peak hours. This can be in some part attributed to local traffic from the Ashton / Bedminster area accessing the A370 via Winterstoke Road in favour of Clift House Spur / Jessops underpass and therefore replacing the A38 Bedminster Down traffic that would have used Ashton Gate underpass were SBL not provided. This is supported by earlier observations relating to the reduction in traffic using Coronation Road and Clift House Road.

On the basis of the submitted analysis, it would therefore appear reasonable to assume that Winterstoke Road would continue to fulfil the purpose of a major route, but one serving more localised trips as opposed to carrying more strategic traffic from outside of the BCC area, as is shown to be the case from the modelling work considered above.

Parson Street gyratory system

BCC highway officers have sought to understand how the re-routing of traffic in the local area as a result of the construction of SBL is forecasted to impact upon the operation of a number of complex interchanges on the local highway network, the first of which being the Parson Street gyratory system, with regard to the comparison between the forecasted level of delay occurring in the with-SBL and without-SBL scenarios. These changes are indicated in a summary table contained within the appendix, which provides a SATURN forecast of the average delay, per vehicle in seconds at each entry point to the junction.

The analysis indicates that delay at the above junction is forecasted to reduce as a result of the removal of significant through traffic from the area, although in similarity to the findings regarding Winterstoke Road, an amount of local traffic is forecasted to return to this junction from minor routes in the Bedminster area as a result of the reduction in delay caused by the re-routing of traffic along the SBL.

A370, connecting slip roads and the Cumberland Basin

The A370 route into Bristol and its adjoining roads between Long Ashton and Hotwells is characterised by a complex series of on and off slip-roads, gyratory systems and at its northern end, a number of signal-controlled junctions. To this end, the area is extremely sensitive to changes in peak hour traffic flow, and the area often experiences significant delay when large events take place at Ashton Court or Ashton Gate Stadium, or on occasions where the plimsoll bridge requires to be opened to allow vessels to access to/from the floating harbour.

Similarly to the issues associated with Parson Street gyratory system, highway officers have sought further detail from the applicant's consultants to better understand how the re-routing of traffic is forecasted to affect the A370 in the Bristol area, and the implications this has for the operation of this part of the highway network.

The analyses forecast that the SBL will result in some changes in the level of delay occurring in and around the A370 as it enters Bristol, in comparison to the situation in the event that the SBL is not

constructed. This can be attributed in some part to the increase in traffic of between 50 and 300 vehicles at various locations using the A370 in favour of routes further east, including Bedminster Down Road, Bishopsworth Road and East Street, Bedminster, as considered earlier, but also an increase in non-citybound traffic using SBL to access the motorway network via the A4 Portway in favour of the City Centre and M32.

As a result of the above, variations occur in the locations at which traffic joins and exits the A370 as a results of the SBL being available. Of particular note is the reduction in traffic (and therefore delay) occurring at the A369 Clanage Road and Jessops underpass entries to the A370, but it is also noted that the increase in traffic on the A370 also results in additional delay for traffic attempting to enter the A370 southbound where Winterstoke Road joins the A370.

In summary of the above findings, the operation of the highway network at the above major interchanges is not forecasted to be adversely affected by the construction of SBL, although it is noted that the behaviour of traffic and how it accesses the A370 will result in changes to a number of the on and off-slip roads in and on the approaches to the Cumberland Basin as a result of variations in spare capacity along adjoining routes generated by changes in driver behaviour further to the south.

Junction Capacity Analysis

It is also necessary to understand the forecasted impact of SBL closer to the proposed route and more specifically, in terms of how the junctions that will carry the route of SBL will operate in the design and future year scenarios, taking into account the revised routing of traffic discussed above.

SBL / South Liberty Lane / Brookgate junction

Whilst the above junction is proposed to be located entirely within North Somerset, it is of specific interest to BCC, given that the northern Brookgate arm of the junction accesses BCC's highway network directly to the north of SBL.

The analysis shows the junction to operate comfortably within capacity in both the design and future year AM and PM peak hour scenarios. Queuing from the Brookgate arm of the junction is forecasted to result in an average queue of not more than 5 vehicles in all scenarios tested.

In relation to the impact on South Liberty Lane and the Ashton Vale Trading Estate, the modelling has incorporated the various constraints to through movements in this area, most notably the localised road narrowings and shuttle signals where South Liberty Lane and Ashton Dive cross the railway line. In relation to the opening up the trading estate to the south via SBL, the model forecasts an insignificant change in flows as a result, with movements along these routes confined largely to local traffic, as opposed to through traffic, which the modelling indicates will remain on the SBL and A370 to access locations further north. This can be attributed to the above constraints, but also the trip-end destinations of traffic using the SBL, the majority of which is forecast to access locations further north than the Ashton/ Bedminster area.

Local businesses in the affected trading estates anticipate the need to review parking restriction as a result of changes in the pattern of traffic. It is clear that on street parking and its impact on access to property is already an issue in parts of the industrial area but there is a possibility that SBL may change or worsen this situation. The council as highway authority will monitor impacts as it does for other parts of the network and the need for any action will need to be considered in consultation with local businesses and priority considered through the Neighbourhood Partnership.

SBL / A38 Signalised Junction

The above junction is also located within North Somerset, but as with the above junction, any congestion occurring along the northern arm may impact upon BCC's highway network and as such, highway officers have scrutinised the modelling impacts with this in mind. The junction is proposed to operate as a four-arm signalised roundabout, with signal control proposed within the gyratory arms of the roundabout as well as the approaches.

In the 2016 scenario the junction has been forecasted to operate comfortably within capacity during the 2016 morning and evening peak hour periods at the A38 northern arm, resulting in a maximum queue of five vehicles, during the morning and evening peak hour periods respectively. In the 2031 scenario and taking into account background traffic growth, the junction continues to operate within capacity during the AM peak, whilst the junction operates just over capacity during the PM peak hour. In relation to the A38(N) arm of the junction, queues are forecasted to not exceed 8 vehicles and 6 vehicles with spare capacity (on the northern arm) of 15% and 27% in the morning and evening peak hours respectively.

The largest modelled queue occurring at this junction is forecasted along the SBL (southeast) arm of the junction in the 2031 evening peak hour, although the forecasted queue of 16 vehicles here is not considered to be significant, given that the design of the junction incorporates a three-lane approach at this arm which will reduce the length of the queue across three lanes, allowing the queuing to dissipate quickly into two lanes of traffic upon a green signal.

SBL / Highridge Road junction & SBL / Queens Road / Grange Road junction

The above two junctions are located entirely within Bristol's highway network and are considered in tandem, as they have been proposed to operate as part of a linked signal Urban Traffic Control (UTC) system operated from the same controller and monitored using cameras linked to BCC's central traffic control centre. The proposed configuration has been proposed to assist with the efficient operation and management of the junctions and minimise the likelihood of the two adjacent junctions to blocking back and therefore negatively effecting each other's operation.

In keeping with the need to minimise congestion that commonly occurs at signal junctions as a result of turning traffic blocking the straight ahead flows, the scheme design has attempted maintained clear priority for straight on traffic through the banning of a number turning movements from Queens Road, King George's Road and Highridge Road. This gives greater priority to traffic using the SBL, and in so doing increases the ability of the junctions to accommodate the forecasted traffic flows associated with the new road.

The above junctions have been assessed to operate within capacity in the 2016 morning and evening peak hour periods. During the 2031 peak hours, the junctions are forecasted to reach capacity in all but one of the scenarios tested, with maximum queues of 56 vehicles along the eastern approach of SBL (westbound) to the Queens Road / Grange Road junction forecasted during the morning peak hour, and 48 vehicles during the evening peak hour. At the Highridge Road junction, a maximum queue of 44 vehicles is forecasted at the Highridge Road (southern arm) during the AM peak.

The above issue has been questioned by highway officers in scrutinising the effectiveness of the proposals in the event that the above forecasts became a reality how this may adversely impact upon the efficient working of the SBL.

A conditional requirement upon the scheme, as set out by the DfT is to ensure that the operation of the SBL is effectively monitored so that in the event that the forecast flows for 2031 are as predicted, a number of demand management measures would need to be considered by BCC as part of the wider transport strategy for the area going forward. To ensure that the operation of junctions along the SBL do not compromise the ability for the efficient operation of public transport, bus priority measures are integral to the scheme and are proposed at each of the signal junctions to minimise the impact of queuing and delay upon bus journey times.

As part of BCC's ongoing and future remit to effectively manage the operation of the SBL and the wider highway network in future years, highway officers are satisfied that regular and careful monitoring of the SBL route will allow BCC to undertake any further interventions as seen fit at that moment in time as part of BCC's strategy for network management. This could include adjustments to signal timings and phasing or the introduction of more advanced Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) in future years.

SBL / Hareclive Road / Whitchurch Lane junction

The above junction has been configured to include signal control where the SBL meets Hareclive Road and also Whitchurch Lane. As previously, the signals will be linked as part of the UTC system and a number of banned turns are proposed to assist in maximising the capacity of the junction and prioritising the flow of traffic along the SBL.

The above junction is forecasted to operate within capacity, with maximum queuing of 12 vehicles occurring on the westbound approach of the SBL in the 2031 peak hour period at the Hareclive Road junction in the 2031 morning peak period. In the 2031 evening peak period, the maximum forecasted queue occurs on the eastern SBL arm of 11 vehicles.

SBL / Cater Road roundabout

The junction is forecasted to continue to operate within capacity, with maximum forecasted queue of 3 vehicles occurring on the westbound approach 2031 peak hour period.

Scheme Design Considerations

Highway officers have assessed the proposed scheme in relation to its design, taking into account the requirements of all transport modes that will require access along, through or across the route of SBL, in conjunction with the operation of the numerous junctions along the route, as detailed above. This has required a number of queries of the design team, including: how traffic speeds will be controlled, the rationale behind the banning of turns, and whether pedestrians and cyclists are provided with suitable facilities to safely navigate across and along the route.

Further to the above, a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit has been undertaken on behalf of the applicants. The findings of this audit have identified a number of localised road safety issues connected with the proposals which will be taken forward to the detailed design stage.

It is accepted to some extent, however that it is not possible to provide the maximum requirement for all movements at all locations, and the needs of accessibility, signal control and public transport provision require to be balanced against the impacts of the SBL upon existing residential access and amenity, green infrastructure and the ability to control and effectively manage traffic.

Speed Limits

The proposed speed limit along the SBL has been considered in the context of the nature of the route, which is urban for the majority of its length within the BCC boundary. Due to the volume of traffic this route is forecasted to accommodate, it is unlikely that any sections of this road would be suitable or appropriate for a 20mph speed limit, and where the SBL enters into North Somerset along a more rural alignment a speed limit of 40mph is considered more appropriate. As discussed earlier, BCC as highway authority would undertake regular monitoring of how this route and its signal junctions operates as part of BCC's remit as local highway authority and this remit includes the monitoring of speed over time in conjunction with the local constabulary to ensure that speeds are kept universally within the set limits that are appropriate for the road.

Pedestrian / Cycle Access

Highway officers have scrutinised the proposals in accordance with local and national policy. It has been necessary to insist upon a minor design change to the scheme in relation to the access across the SBL for pedestrians and cyclists wishing to access the Malago cycleway at the Cater Road end of the SBL. This and other local improvements to the cycling provision will be sought through condition.

Subject to the above, highway officers are satisfied that the design considerations relating to the use of the SBL route by all-modes have been fully considered in relation to pedestrian and cycle usage, with the scheme design incorporating a continuous shared use footway / cycleway of 3 metres in width cycleway proposed along its northern side, and a 2 metre continuous footway along the southern side of SBL between Whitchurch Lane and Highridge Green.

Public Rights of Way

The only necessary diversions will be to recently designated PROWS across the reserve corridor and the proposed localised realignments are necessary and appropriate to maintain north/south routes for pedestrians. The applicant will need to secure formal diversions separately under Highway legislation

Public Transport

The SBL route is proposed to be a multi-modal corridor. In addition to the considerations provided above in relation to the operation of the network and accessibility by non-motorised modes, the scheme design has taken into account the need for the route to successfully accommodate public transport services. This is an important requirement of the route, if it is to function as an efficient connection for areas of existing and proposed housing, employment and local community facilities.

Highway officers are satisfied that the design considerations of the scheme have fully taken into consideration the need for public transport accessibility, through the regular positioning of fully accessible bus stops, along with the identification of a routing strategy in association with the MetroBus proposals. This will enable the route to accommodate the high quality public transport facilities as an integral part of the wider improvements for public transport in the city, which will allow public transport to bypass existing congested routes to access the city centre.

The above improvements are assisted by a number measures aimed at increasing the efficiency of public transport, including bus priority measures at the signal junctions as identified earlier, bus lane between the A38 and Brookgate junction and a dedicated bus-only link between the Brookgate junction and the Ashton Vale – Temple Meads (AVTM)route spur at Long Ashton Park & Ride.

A proposed revision to the AVTM route has been confirmed since the application for the SBL was submitted. This revision comprises a re-routing of the AVTM from its originally planned alignment along Prince Street and into the City Centre, in favour of a route that continues along Commercial Road and via Temple Meads before entering the City Centre from the east.

Concerns have been raised regarding the modelling of the SBL and in particular, the assumptions that are made around the routing of AVTM. These relate to the fact that the modelling to support SBL is based upon the previous AVTM scheme and not the revised scheme as currently proposed. A comparison of the change in routing has been assessed as part of a BCC Cabinet paper. This provided a review of the impact of changes to the AVTM route and found that the impact of the changes would be local to the revised section of the AVTM route and as such the impacts are considered to be small.

Highway officers are content that any such change to journey times and passenger numbers of this revision is unlikely to be significant to the operation of SBL. This view is shared by the DfT, who have confirmed that the revised AVTm scheme does not represent a significant change from the original scheme which formed the basis for the Transport and Works Act Order, which has, as of November 2013 received their backing.

Construction Management

There will be highway impacts during the construction of SBL. The council as highway authority has a duty to minimise disruption but it is considered that conditions should be attached to enable agreement about the overall phasing of works and to manage other aspects (such as construction traffic routing) through a Construction Environment Management Plan. NSC raised comments regarding management of traffic at Cumberland Basin and phasing of works. These are both existing purposes of the council as highway authority, to monitor and respond to network management issues including coordination of works in the highway.

Overall Summary

The information submitted with the Transport Assessment is considered to be robust in terms of its methodology, scope and outputs. This has enabled officers to understand and interrogate, where appropriate, aspects of the traffic modelling and forecasting. The predictions for changes to traffic movements are considered to be credible for the wider area impacts and they enable a robust assessment to be undertaken of the impact on particular parts of the network including new junctions along SBL. In traffic terms it is considered that the wider network will not be adversely affected by the construction of SBL. This is not surprising as a purpose of SBL is to provide a new strategic highway route in the locality to support growth as set out in the Core Strategy.

The assessment predicts, therefore, a shift of traffic from the wider area onto the SBL route with roads such as King Georges Road experiencing a significant level of traffic increase. Conversely other roads in the local area, such as King s Head Lane, will benefit from reductions in through traffic.

New or altered junctions along SBL have been assessed as performing within capacity at peak times in 2016 and 2031 with one exception. It is forecast there will be of higher levels of delay experienced in 2031 at the eastbound approach to the Highridge Road junction and westbound approach to the Queens Road junction. The junction has been designed in this way so that any significant queues occur outside of King Georges Road. Subject to further monitoring over the next 15 years it will be

possible to consider appropriate interventions at these junctions to deal with the observed nature of queuing traffic in the future.

Highway and junction design has to take into account the needs of all road users and traffic types, the strategic purpose of SBL, highway safety, highway maintenance matters, visual impact and land take. It is considered that a good balance has been achieved between all these factors within the design. A key factor in the approach has been a restriction to the number of vehicle movements available at the junctions in order to increase capacity, provide appropriate priority for pedestrians and cyclists crossings and minimise land take.

The scheme is supported in terms of its traffic impacts and highway design.

D ARE THE NOISE, VIBRATION AND AIR QUALITY IMPACTS ACCEPTABLE

In summary, policy BCS23 says that development should be sited and designed in a way to avoid adverse impacts on environmental amenity or biodiversity by reason of pollution including noise, vibration and air quality. The viability of existing uses by reason of their sensitivity to noise or other pollution should be assessed. This policy largely reflects matters covered in BLP ME2. SA&DM policy DM33 provides some additional elements for consideration including a recognition that development that has the potential for an unacceptable impact, but is considered desirable for reasons of economic or wider social need, will be expected to provide an appropriate scheme of mitigation that may include on site measures or a financial contribution.

Of particular relevance to the assessment of noise and vibration is a national scheme of compensation for road construction set down in the Noise Insulation Regulations 1975 as amended 1988.

Noise and Vibration impact

The Environmental Statement includes an analysis of the predicted noise and vibration impacts of the scheme and your Pollution Control officer has confirmed that the methodology is appropriate.

The introduction of the predicted levels of traffic onto existing and new sections of road along the SBL corridor has unsurprisingly given rise to predictions of significant increases in noise and vibration to property near to the route. Conversely, on those routes that will experience a reduction of traffic, there will be a reduction in levels.

An appropriate approach to mitigation in your officers view is to assess first if noise barriers can be used to contain noise within the confines of the road. Along this urban section of the route it is accepted that there are very limited opportunities to implement this approach because effective noise containment requires continuous lengths of barrier. For significant parts of the route that are fronted by houses and multiple driveways this is not practical. Furthermore, barriers near to the road edge would be visually unacceptable in you officers view and would also create severance. This approach can be appropriate, however, where there is sufficient width and planting to screen the noise fence and this is being proposed along one section of the scheme (along the boundary with St Pius X School and on the boundary with property directly opposite).

The next level of mitigation would be to provide protection at the façade of affected property. This approach is recognised in national regulations (Noise Insulation Regulations 1975 as amended 1988)

specifically relating to the construction of new roads or altered road where statutory compensation arrangements are set out for works to property where certain levels of noise are exceeded.

These regulations set out a requirement for mandatory compensation in relation to new roads (regulation 4) and discretionary compensation (regulation 4) for altered roads. For the lengths of new road, principally along the reserve corridor between Queens Road and Whitchurch Lane, only one property (12 Innox Gardens) is predicted to qualify for noise insulation measures. On the altered sections of road (principally on Highridge Green and King Georges Road) it is predicted that 88 properties would qualify for discretionary compensation. The applicant has stated that they will look to undertake measures for this group of properties but is unable to commit to discretionary compensations for the project.

There is also a significant number of other properties, in the region of 150 that will be subject to significant increases on noise levels but not caught by the provisions in the regulations. There is obvious concern about the impact of the scheme on these properties but it is considered that it would not be reasonable to seek additional mitigation beyond that set down at national level through legislation. The legislation is specifically aimed at dealing with impacts of new road construction and it would not appropriate for planning authorities at the local level to adopt a different approach to mitigation.

In summary, whilst properties away from the SBL corridor are predicted to benefit from a reduction of noise and vibration due to a reduction in traffic, a large number of properties near to the SBL route will experience significant increases in noise and vibration levels. There are limited opportunities to introduce effective noise barriers near to the road and therefore there are concerns about the impact on properties that will experience increases in noise levels. However, it is considered that the correct approach to property mitigation is to adopt national regulation that will result in one property benefiting from mandatory protection and 88 others to be assessed by the applicant for discretionary protection.

Air Quality

As for noise, the impact on air quality near to the route of the SBL is an important aspect of the objections received.

The full comments of your officer advising on air quality impacts is reproduced above. He has confirmed that the approach to the assessment within the Environmental Statement is appropriate. The assessment confirms that there will be "large" increases in levels of Nitrogen Dioxide along the route with worse cases being in King Georges Road and Highridge Green and some properties near to the reserve corridor. PM10 (particle pollution) increases along the route are negligible or small.

It is considered that air quality standards and objectives set out in Air Quality Strategy should be used to assess the acceptability of the impacts. The assessment shows that the standards arising from these regulations are not exceeded at the worst case locations. It is of note that the design of the junctions at each end of King Georges Road will mean that peak time queuing will predominantly be on the approach to these junctions rather that with King Georges Road itself so as to minimise air quality impacts in the road itself.

Whilst there is a clear worsening of air quality along the route of SBL there are some improvements predicted including within the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) around Parsons Street junction. Not all locations within the AQMA currently exceed air quality standards and, therefore, the predicted

small increases in pollution levels in the AQMA at Blackmoors Lane (to the north of Brunel Way) is not of concern because it is still within the standards set for this area.

A comments has been received that some particular properties have not been specifically mentioned in the assessment (eg Gatehouse Centre). This is not an issue because the locations chosen for modelling are worse case for exposure to changes to air quality.

In summary for air quality impacts the assessment methodology is robust and has been carried out to the required standard. The scheme does not lead to any additional excedence of air quality strategy objectives limits and in certain areas of the AQMA, substantial improvements in air quality are predicted.

E. ARE THE VISUAL, LANDSCAPE IMPACTS AND THE AFFECT ON THE MALAGO AND BISHOPSWORTH CONSERVATION AREA ACCEPTABLE.

Several policies have relevance to this key issue. In summary they are:

BCS21 requires new development to deliver high quality urban design.

SA & DM policies 26, 27,28 and 31 further elaborate on BCS21 and cover considerations including, with particular relevance to the construction of new or adapted streets, the need to respond to local character and distinctiveness, the importance of green infrastructure, sense of place and quality public realm and responding to heritage assets, in this case the Malago and Bishosworth Conservation Area.

BCS22 states that proposals will safeguard or enhance heritage assets including conservation areas and archaeological remains.

BCS09 relates to green Infrastructure. None of the identified strategic green infrastructure links are affected by SBL but individual green assets should be retained unless it is allowed for as part of an adopted core strategy policy. Nevertheless appropriate mitigation is required including new and enhanced green infrastructure on or off site. The policy also protects open space that is important for recreation, leisure, community use, townscape and landscape quality and visual amenity.

BLP policy NE3 protects valuable trees or woodland unless any harm can be mitigated by replacement and additional planting.

SA & DM policy 15 provides more detail on how green infrastructure should be designed and provided including the multi purposes of tree planting for visual, wildlife and urban cooling. Wherever practical new green infrastructure will be expected to maximise the range of green infrastructure benefits achieved.

SA & DM policy 17 covers existing green infrastructure and refers to the need to protect designated Important Open Space. None of the application site is designated as Important Open Space. Highridge Common is not designated under this policy but it is green belt and a Site of Nature Conservation Interest and assessed in this terms elsewhere in this report. The policy also offers protection to other open spaces not specifically identified which are locally important for recreation, leisure, visual and townscape amenity and community use. The policy sets out a tree replacement standard where tree loss is essential to allow for appropriate development.

In applying these policies and considering consultation responses under this key issue it is appropriate to divide the route of SBL into separate sections because the existing landscape and visual character varies along the route.

Brook Gate/South Liberty Lane

Relatively minor works are required in the BCC area to connect SBL to Brook Gate and South Liberty Lane, as the main junction works are in NSC area. The works in BCC area comprise the formation of a T- junction on Brook Gate and 8 new off road parking spaces to compensate for on street losses due to the formation of the junction. There is insufficient detail of alterations to boundaries and hard landscape but this can be covered by condition, but otherwise the proposals are acceptable.

Colliters Brook

Relatively small but important works are proposed on a section of Colliters Brook (at chainage 1450). This is a pinch point created between the brook and Hanging Hill wood in NSC. One of the comments BCC made to NSC as consultation to the adjoining LPA was to ask NSC to assess the justification for a 4 lane section of road in this location because of the environmental sensitivities of the brook and woodland in NSC area. It is for NSC to come to a view on the acceptability of the width of the road and they agreed to grant planning permission for the proposal in this form at the beginning of November.

The works comprise the realignment (by straightening) of about 30m of brook to provide space for the road, shared cycle/walking path and a public footpath diversion between the road and brook. Subject to adequate environmental controls during construction and further details of the land form/brook works and planting, these works would be acceptable, although a scheme that did not disturb the brook would be preferable. The visual appearance of this area will be improved if the proposed public footpath diversion ran closer to the brook as this will allow for some screening of the retailing wall supporting the road at this point. This matter is proposed to be dealt with by condition.

Highridge Common

The common land comprises open grassland with scattered scrub and some limited tree cover, enclosed along the western boundary by hedgerows. Highridge Green and Highridge Road align with the eastern and southern boundaries of the common. The latter is fronted by a more regular arrangement of two storey detached and semi-detached residential properties within generously sized plots, most with individual vehicles accesses. Highridge Green comprises a more mixed range of sizes, styles and sizes with differing set backs and levels of tree planting fronting the common.

The common falls within the Bishopsworth and Malago Conservation Area the character of which is mainly defined by the largely open landscape of the common.

About half of SBL in this section is formed by a widening of Highridge Green (between no 143 to the junction with Highridge Road) from approximately 7m to 13.3m. Within the 13.3m width is included the 3m wide off carriageway shared cycling/walking path, positioned between the carriageway and adjoining property. The rest of SBL to the boundary between BCC and NSC is a completely new piece of road construction and runs across the northern section of the common.

The road would require the removal of two sections of native hedge and three trees to enable the road construction and to provide visual and practical connection between the existing and new common

land to the west. Elsewhere 8 trees would be felled including a group near to the junction with Highridge Road to facilitate junction and bus stop.

SBL will have a significant visual impact on part of the common. It is concluded above, in the context of green belt assessment, that SBL will retain the openness of the landscape because the road will in the main closely follow the contours of the land. Some consultees have asked for additional tree planting to screen the road but this understandable request needs to be balanced (as set out in key issue G below on ecology) against the adverse ecological impacts of additional tree planting on the unimproved grassland of the common and the protection of the open grassland character of the common. On order to protect this ecology and character it is recommended that the proposed clumps of new trees shown on the submitted drawing to the west of the SBL are removed but repositioned around the new Highridge Green junction where they will offer a better visual screen from the road from nearby properties.

The hedge loss is not adequately compensated for on plans submitted so far but the applicant has confirmed that replacement hedge planting can be carried out on the north side of SBL in this location. It will also help screen views of the road. This will be secured by condition.

It is judged that SBL will nevertheless create substantial harm to this part of the Conservation Area. However, the NPPF provides that such harm may be outweighed by substantial public benefits of the development. The principle of SBL is supported in the BCS as set out in key issue A above and even taking into account the challenges from consultees to the purpose of SBL to bring traffic and economic benefits it is considered that these wider public benefits do outweigh the substantial harm to this part of the Conservation Area. The approach to landscape is appropriate subject to changes to planting proposals as set out above.

King Georges Road

The character here changes significantly to a suburban residential street of two storey detached and semi-detached properties, each with front and rear gardens enclosed by a variety of boundary treatments. Each side of the road is fronted by a strip of wide amenity grass with a row of intermittent trees, a reflection of the long standing aspiration to create a major road connection along this corridor. This verge is traversed by strips of tarmac surfacing used as crossovers to individual properties and informal parking. Footways run alongside the property boundaries.

The proposal will widen the existing carriageway from 5.5m to 9m.. Five 2m wide pedestrian refuges will be provided and a continuous so called "median strip" in contrasting materials within this widened carriageway. The foot way on the north side will be widened to provide the shared cycle/walkway. Existing 13 trees would be felled with 58 trees proposed along a retained but narrower verge and also in amenity grass area near the junction with Highridge Road.

The design challenges of achieving a safe and functioning highway that is visually acceptable are compounded here because of the fixed width of land available, defined by front boundaries to properties in the road. The carriageway has been widened not solely because of the change in importance of the road itself but to provide space along the centre to provide refuges for crossing and for residents to more safely to turn into drives without unduly delaying other traffic. Another consideration is to ensure that the road is not so narrow that any major repair and maintenance would require closure in both directions.

Officers support the decision to fell all existing trees and comprehensively replant a new boulevard because even though some of the existing trees are of reasonable quality there is a high risk, in this confined working area, that they would be damaged during construction. It is considered better to replant a consistent and matched group of trees. One area of concern however is that initially the applicant has not provided a survey of underground services to give sufficient confidence that all these new trees can be planted. Response from applicant awaited. Despite this additional information from the applicant (assuming it comes) there is a residual risk that unexpected underground services may conflict with tree planting. To minimise the risk of this preventing some trees being planted it is recommended that the condition requiring submission of landscape details specifically includes the expectation that it will include root barriers details to enable planting in close proximity to services such as sewers and water pipes.

The increase in traffic and the imposition of waiting restrictions in the road raises some concerns that the level of informal verge parking will increased. This could create safety issues as well as causing damage to planting. The more comprehensive and continuous tree planting will help to minimise this problem but it is recommended that additional measures should be explored as part of the submission of detailed landscape proposals to discharge conditions.

This street also lies within the Bishopsworth and Malago Conservation Area. The character and appearance of the street will change but mainly as a result of the impact of more traffic on its character rather than the appearance of the street as such. In one sense the introduction of a more comprehensive tree planting scheme could be argued to improve one aspect of the appearance of the street. However taken all factors into account it is considered that SBL would create substantial harm to this part of the Conservation Area but, as for the assessment of the impact on Highridge Common, it is considered that the wider public benefits of SBL outweigh the substantial harm to this part of the Conservation Area.

Reserve Corridor (Queens Road to Hareclive Road)

After crossing Queens Road the route enters an area of open grassland and scrub scattered with trees which forms a green corridor east-west between areas of housing from Queens Road to Hareclive Road. It tends to be more informal in character within the narrower section at the Queens Road end then opens out from Heggard Close to a wider and more open area of grass up to Hareclive Road. The corridor is used for informal recreation and is crossed by surfaced and unsurfaced pathway connections between the housing estates each side. These are characterised by two storey detached and semi-detached properties with some three storey apartment blocks arranged along cul de sacs accessed from Goulston Road and Gatehouse Avenue. The route passes directly north of the Gatehouse Centre, a mixed community and employment facility adjacent to Hareclive Road and other non residential uses such as St Pius X School, that backs on to the reserve corridor.

A new 7.5m wide single carriageway would be constructed along the reserve corridor. The 3m wide shared cycleway will be provided along the northern side. A footway along the southern side would leave the carriageway edge between Gatehouse Way and a proposed bus stop next to the Gatehouse Centre and thread its way through the retained area of open space. Some open space will also be retained on the northern side along the same length. A characteristic proposed landscape feature of this section of the road will be the introduction of a 4m wide landscape strip in the centre of the road. Two uncontrolled and one light controlled crossings would be provided through this landscape feature.

The existing landscape character of this section of the route is more informal than elsewhere and it is considered that this character is appropriately reflected in the design of the landscape associated with the road. The road in this section would require the loss of 6 trees and parts of naturalised groups of planting in the narrower section of the corridor. In mitigation new areas of planting are proposed including approximately 60 trees, areas of shrub planting and native hedgerow. Other areas of vegetation are being retained with some management to encourage tree growth. A particular issue for this area is the huge variety of boundary treatments and some require rationalisation in association with the design of the detailed planting scheme. This is proposed to be covered by condition.

The narrowness of the reserve corridor near to Queens Road end means the scope for planting is more limited. The southern edge would be formed by an extension of the native hedge and part of the northern edge would be formed by a narrowed group of existing vegetation. It means that the area adjoining the bus stop on the northern side will be relatively open. Due to the narrowness of this part of the corridor and the need to align with King Georges Road it has not been possible to provide land for screen planting in the application site. This is disappointing but a potential advantage is that the bus stop will receive natural surveillance from the adjoining flats at Waverley Gardens. Comments from the adjoining property have requested no noise fence so that there is a view through to the activity on the road but some planting instead. It is recommended the scope for planting is further explored when detailed landscape drawings are submitted.

Approximately the first 100m of SBL from Queens Road is also in the Bishopsworth and Malago Conservation Area. As for other sections of the route it is judged that SBL would create substantial harm to this part of the Conservation Area but it is considered that the wider public benefits of SBL outweigh the substantial harm to this part of the Conservation Area.

This is the only part of the scheme that proposes acoustic noise barriers. Visually this is acceptable because they can be worked within the boundary planting.

Hareclive Road junction to Cater Road roundabout

This area is defined by Hareclive Road, Whitchurch Lane and Whitland Road and this section of the SBL reserve corridor has some differences in landscape character compared to the previous section. It opens out to a larger area of green space largely devoid of mature planting and strong character. It is fronted by a mixture of residential properties along Whitland Road to the south and Lidl supermarket and commercial properties of Cater Road Business Park to the north, fronting Whitchurch Lane.

From Cater Road roundabout to Lidl supermarket, SBL is formed by the widening of Whitchurch Lane from an average of approximately 9m to 13.3m in order to accommodate a 3m wide shared cycle path and a central strip to assist traffic turning right into businesses along this frontage. The rest of SBL is a newly constructed road that forms a new junction with Hareclive Road, with new bus stops. Existing bus stops on Hareclive Road are repositioned slightly.

It is proposed to fell three trees, but detailed design of this area may allow their retention, but new planting comprising 34 trees and areas of amenity shrub planting is proposed. Two areas of detention basins are included to provide sustainable urban drainage for this section of SBL.

The additional tree and shrub planting is welcome to compensate for tree loses and to improve the character and appearance of the area. Given the largely 'blank canvas' of this particular part of the route officers consider that the scheme has not taken the opportunity to introduce a more distinctive

hard and soft landscape solution. The area near to Hareclive Road will comprise two new SBL bus stops, existing bus stops on Hareclive Road and it is also an important pedestrian route between Lidl, Cater Business Park and residential areas to the south.

This area is, therefore, something of a hub that should be recognised in the approach to hard and soft landscape. It is recommended, therefore, that detailed drawings to be submitted later should address this deficiency specifically by the redesign of the triangular area to the south of Lidl Supermarket so as to provide a more formal design of hard and soft landscape so as to create a recognisable place associated with the proposed and existing bus stops and pedestrian routes through the area. Other improvements to the pedestrian and cycle connections in this area will be sought as well at the detailed design stage in response to comments received (covered above in the report on responses to consultation).

Bus stops and junctions

Pairs of bus stops are provided at the junctions of SBL with Highridge Road, Queens Road and Hareclive Road. (bus stops are also provided near the Brook Gate junction but these lie in NSC area)

There is an additional impact on appearance of the scheme due to the localised widening of the carriageway to provide bus layby and this is often in combination with additional carriageway and street furniture at altered junctions.

Junction design has to be a balancing of competing demands of factors including bus priority, safe and attractive crossing for pedestrians and cyclists, minimising delay to general traffic, minimising land take and visual impact. Generally, the scale of junctions has been reduced as far as possible by restricting the number of turning movements that are possible. This maximises the capacity of the junction, provides better provision for pedestrians and cyclists as well as reducing the visual impact on the area and its landscape. This approach is supported.

Further design details will be required to be submitted for approval and this will provide the opportunity to ensure that the standard of hard and soft landscaping is appropriate and importantly that all aspects of street design, including street furniture, is coordinated and rationalised as far as possible.

The submitted drawings show the layout of proposed bus stops but further details of shelter and associated street furniture will need to be submitted for approval. A document entitled "Visual Identity Guidelines "has been submitted that provides a brief for achieving a visually attractive and coordinated design and this is referred to in the relevant condition.

Trees

The impact on trees and hedges has been assessed for each section of the route and is judged to be acceptable or requiring variations, to be secured by condition. The tree officer has confirmed that the Bristol tree replacement standard requires 93 trees to be planted to compensate for the 25, mostly low value, trees to be felled. The proposed 172 replacement trees is sufficient therefore to provide replacement and help mitigate the impact of the scheme.

In conclusion, SBL will have a significant impact on the character and appearance of the area, including the part of the scheme falling within the Bishopsworth and Malago Conservation Area. The wider public benefits of the scheme outweigh the substantial harm to the conservation area. Subject

to the submission of further detailed scheme design drawings that will include amendments to some aspects of the scheme as set out above, it is considered that the scheme responds well to the different landscaping characters along the route and there is an appropriate level of tree and other planting to compensate for losses of vegetation and to sufficiently mitigation the impacts of the scheme itself.

F ARE THE ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS ACCEPTABLE?

Policies BCS9, BLP policies ME2, NE5, NE11 and draft SA &DM policy19 collectively require careful assessment of the impact of development on ecology. They seek to protect habitat or provide compensation for any unavoidable loss of features or habitats.

The scheme affects Sites of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) at Highridge Common and Colliters Brook.

There would be a significant impact on Highridge Common because the widened section of Highridge Green and new sections of road will remove areas of important unimproved grass land. The general alignment of SBL across the common is shown in the Core Strategy and draft SA and DM site allocation. It is considered that the detailed alignment taken by the proposal has minimised the loss of grassland by keeping as close to the existing alignment of Highridge Green as far as possible before SBL is then formed by a new section of road heading in a north westerly direction.

The loss of this habitat will be compensated within the proposed additional common land, an area greater that lost to the road construction, that has the potential with the right management to recreate the ecology of the SNCI. This land will be managed in order to recreate a similar grass land including the relocation of turves affected by the road construction. Although most of the replacement common will be in NSC area the applicant has confirmed that it will be owned and managed by BCC. It will be necessary to attach a condition specific to the ecological mitigation for Highridge Common to minimise damage to the common during construction; secure the relocation of turves and the establishment of the grass land on the replacement common.

The proposal to carry out tree planting on the common is considered to be unacceptable because the SNCI is designated for its grass land. This matter needs to be balanced against the view that planting should be used to help screen the common. Furthermore the landscape character of the common is one of openness. It is proposed therefore that some of the tree planting on the west side of the road is removed and relocated near to the junction with Highridge Green where it will create better screening for residents and will be on amenity grass land of less ecological value. This can be secured by a variation condition.

Only a very small part of the Colliters Brook SNCI in BCC area is impacted by the scheme. This is a point along the route that has to thread its way between the brook and Hanging Hill ancient woodland in NSC area. To balance the impacts on these two constraints it is proposed to realign a short section of the brook and this is considered to be acceptable subject to approving the detailed design and overaching construction, ecological and pollution control condition. These aspects can be managed as part of a scheme wide Construction Environment Management Plan

Regarding the swift colony on the common identified by an objector it is considered that any impact would be negligible.

Other comments from your Nature Conservation Officer cover a requirement for conditions to manage construction works without harming the SNCIs and maximising the ecological potential of new landscape. Comments are also made about the long term management of landscape area. The applicant has confirmed that all new landscape will be taken into the Council's maintenance arrangements but it is considered that there is a need for the normal requirement to replace failed landscape within a 10 year period and a specific condition covering a ten year period for the establishment of the replacement common land as special requirements for management and monitoring will be required.

Opportunities will be taken when detailed landscape schemes are submitted for approval to use native species for the benefit of wildlife.

The development has to be assessed under the Habitats Regulations. Natural England has confirmed that information submitted as part of the Environmental Statement is satisfactory and that there are no predicted harmful impacts on European protected sites or SSSI's at Ashton Court and Avon Gorge. The condition requested will be covered by the Construction Environment Management Plan and the bespoke condition for ongoing maintenance of the common Replacement land.

In summary, the major ecological impact is on Highridge Common. It is considered that this harm is compensated by the replacement common land subject to conditions to require the establishment of an appropriate grassland. Other ecological interests during construction can be protected by conditions and opportunities along the route will be taken to enhance the ecological value of the new landscaping.

G. THE IMPACT ON THE RECREATION USE AND COMMONER RIGHTS ON HIGHRIDGE COMMON

The visual, landscape and ecological impacts on the common are considered within key issues above. The common also has an important recreational purpose and BLP policy NE1 seeks to maintain and enhance where possible, such areas of open space.

SBL will result in the loss of common land and introduce additional road severance due to the widening on Highridge Green and a new section of road and this will impact on its recreational value. The proposed mitigation for the loss of common is to provide a new area of so called "exchange land" positioned immediately to the west of the existing common. The area of common to be lost to road construction is approximately 0.7ha and the new common land will be approximately 2.47ha. The visual and ecological character of the new common will be consistent with the existing common and it is considered that the scheme makes the best possible connection between new old. A wider connection would have been preferred but this would have involved taking land at Highridge Cottage and the removal of additional hedges.

In relation to commoners rights the applicant will have to pursue approval from the Secretary of State for the exchange land under section 19 of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981. This will assess the suitability of the replacement in terms of its size and that it is equally advantageous to people with common rights and the public. It will ensure for example that commoners rights are transferred to the exchange land.

In terms of severance concerns the scheme proposes one controlled crossing point at the junction with Highridge Road and three uncontrolled crossing points along the section through the common. Between the uncontrolled crossing island a median strip of different material will be used to provide

further informal refuge for pedestrian not wishing to cross at the crossing points. Suggestion made for providing such as a pedestrian bridges would be visual unacceptable and would be unattractive to use, creating their own public safety concerns.

There is a degree of overlap between the planning assessment and the other legal processes in terms of the size, connection and value of the land. It is concluded that sufficient replacement common land in terms of area, location and type has been proposed and in terms of mitigating severance the highway design has introduced a reasonable number of crossing places and other features to minimise as far as possible the severing effect of the road.

H.DOES THE SCHEME ADOPT AN APPROPRIATE APPROACH TO SUSTAINABLE DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION, CRIME AND DISORDER ISSUES AND HEALTH?

The group of policies BCS13-16 cover climate change considerations, energy, sustainable design & construction and flood risk & water management.

The application is supported by a good standard of Sustainability Statement. Policy BCS15 promotes the use of BREAM but this is not appropriate for this type of project so the applicant has used CEEQUAL, an Assessment and Awards Scheme for improving sustainability in civil engineering, infrastructure, landscaping and public realm projects to test its sustainability credentials The project proposes to achieve a Very Good Rating (within the range of categories of Pass, Good, Very Good and Excellent). As for the Breeam assessment this is a very helpful way of capturing a broad range of sustainability matters through the design, construction and environmental management of the project. A condition will be used to secure a Very Good rating.

An important aspect of the project will be the management of waste materials (eg excavated material) and new construction material. Even if a CEEQUAL Very Good rating is achieved there is no certainty that ambitious and appropriate targets will be set and achieved in order to reduce the use of new materials and maximise recycling levels for construction materials. This is an aspect of the project that has not yet been fully assessed by the applicant and, therefore, a separate condition is proposed requiring agreement of targets for certain aspects of materials reuse and supply. The scheme by law is required to have a Site waste management Plan and this will complement the planning condition proposed to set out targets for the management and supply of materials.

With respect to energy use in operation of the development, policy BCS14 sets out an approach of firstly minimising energy use and a requirement that 20% of the energy demand is produced from renewable technologies. This development is not typical in that it does not principally involve the construction of buildings, but there will be energy demands from bus shelters, highway lighting etc. Because all BCC's street lighting electricity supply (including traffic signals and illuminated signs) is provided by e-on from 100% renewable sources then it is considered that the proposal will exceed the requirements of the policy.

Regarding flood risk, comments from the Environmental Agency relate in the main to matters that NSC will have to deal with as parts of the route lie within the Colliters Brook/Ashton Vale flood plain.

In Bristol the route crosses the narrow floodplain for the river Malago near to the junction with Queens Road. It is appropriate to ask if there is a sequentially preferable alignment for SBL that would avoid this flood plain but given the generally east-west alignment of SBL here and the north-south alignment of the river it is inevitable that the two will intersect at some point. Furthermore, within the built up area there are no realistic alternatives for the construction of SBL apart from the corridor which is identified

on this alignment in the Core Strategy. In addition, the Malago is largely culverted where the proposed route is to cross, hence reducing the risk of flooding from the watercourse.

Within the BCC area other flood risk issues concern potential localised flooding risk as a result of the road construction. The detailed design of highway drainage should ensure that there are no adverse impacts on local drainage and wherever practical it should incorporate sustainable drainage techniques. In the submitted drawings the principle of using detentions ponds is shown in the Hareclive Road area where, compared to other sections of the route, there is a relatively generous landscaped area to do this without prejudicing other uses of the land such as informal recreation. The amount of drainage that can be accommodated in this manner will require further assessment to establish sensible depths of the ponds and integration into the landscape. Elsewhere it may be necessary to use other techniques to reduce run off, such as oversized pipework, to deal with high rain fall events. This detail will be covered by condition and assessed alongside other matters such as soft landscaping. As indicated within the FRA, the detailed designs will also consider the drainage from the wider catchment impacting on the new road, as well as from the road itself. This is particularly the case where the route crosses Highridge Common and Queens Road, which are areas known to suffer from regular flooding from surface water runoff.

As required by SA & DM policy DM13 this application has been accompanied by a Health Impact Assessment. There is a broad scope to the assessment and key Issues above deal with particular aspects of health impact such as air quality and noise. The BCC Healthy Urban Team has concluded that the overall methodology appears robust and the rationale and objectives for the scheme are clearly defined. A number of detailed comments are made. Officers have used comments in square brackets to respond to these are they are dealt with in relevant Key Issues.

The Health impact Assessment listed 6 recommendations designed to maximise the health and wellbeing benefits. Apart from matters to deal with noise mitigation, your officers consider that the acceptability of the proposal does not turn on whether the other 5 recommendations are fully carried through but the applicant, nevertheless, has set out the intentions to deliver these as follows:

1. Community development activities and active travel activities should be undertaken along the route, involving local communities particularly would help to ensure local people use the scheme fully

• The tree planting to be carried out by TreeBristol in the reserved corridor is likely to be run as a community planting event, giving local people a sense of ownership in the project and its landscaping (almost 20% of the 1,251 trees planted by TreeBristol in 2012/13 were planted at community planting events).

- Initial discussions have been held with the Forest of Avon Trust into ways that further local engagement over tree planting can be held with residents in King Georges Road.
- There are policies enshrined in the Joint Local Transport Plan (JLTP3) and the Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) projects to encourage the use of more sustainable modes of transport through initiative such as travel plans, marketing, and events.
- 2. A plan showing existing cycle routes and how the SBL links in with them is developed. It would help existing cyclists to plan their journeys and would also enable the uptake of cycling by more people

- There are policies enshrined in the JLTP3 and the LSTF projects to encourage the use of more sustainable modes of transport through initiative such as travel plans, marketing, and events.
- 3. A commitment to the use of green (energy efficient/low carbon energy) fleet for the scheme
- It is currently proposed that operator(s) of MetroBus services will procure the vehicles. Dieselelectric, hybrid drive technology as the minimum preferred powertrain for the MetroBus vehicles was endorsed by the Joint Transport Executive Committee (JTEC) on 31 July 2013. As detailed discussions with operators are progressed, opportunities to further reduce emissions and fuel consumption will be explored.
- 4. BCC and NSC consider setting a minimum local workforce target, including a commitment to employ local unemployed people, during construction and for the organisation and running of the RT route, maintenance of stops and route, and highway maintenance on the SBL link road
- The possibility of doing this will be investigated, although the councils will be bound by their need to comply with relevant laws, including employment and procurement legislation.
- 5. Ensure that the service provides an affordable (in line with other local bus services) and physically accessible mode of transport
- The minimum vehicle specification for the MetroBus network, complemented by the agreed standard for stops and interchanges, will ensure that the service is highly accessible to passengers. The level of fares will be agreed by the authorities promoting the MetroBus network and the operator(s) and the provisions of any QPS (Quality Partnership Scheme) or similar agreement. The QPS specification includes the potential to set a maximum fare (as long as it is commercially viable), and the councils will seek to ensure fares on MetroBus services are consistent with those on the background bus network.

In this assessment due regard has been had to duties within The Crime and Disorder Act 1998, aimed at reducing crime and fear of crime. This is an important consideration as part of the physical design of the new and altered highway, such as bus stops and pedestrian routes. The comments made by the Crime Prevention Design Advisor have been taken into account in the design of the scheme so far and will be further considered when more detail proposals are submitted to discharge conditions.

In conclusion, the application has sufficiently addressed the broad range of issues covered by policies BCS13-16. Taking into account the proposal to achieve a Very Good CEEQUAL rating and conditions to manage material use, and the future approval of the detail of drainage so as to maximise the use of SUDS, the approach to sustainable design and construction is supported. Matters relating to health impact and crime & disorder have also been adequately addressed.

SUMMARY and CONCLUSION

Refer to the top of the report at page 3.

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY How much Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will this development be required to pay?

Development of less than 100 square metres of new build that does not result in the creation of a new dwelling; development of buildings that people do not normally go into, and conversions of buildings in

lawful use, are exempt from CIL. This application falls into one of these categories and therefore no CIL is payable.

RECOMMENDED GRANTED subject to condition(s)

Time limit for commencement of development

1. Full Planning Permission

The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission.

Reason: As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Act 2004.

Pre commencement condition(s)

2. Construction Phases

No works, including any site clearance or demolition works, shall take place until a Works Programme, showing the subdivision of the scheme into defined work phases has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the construction of the development hereby approved shall not proceed other than in accordance with the approved construction phasing plan.

Reason: It is necessary that the stages of development and the provision of associated infrastructure follow a co-ordinated sequence and in order to minimise construction impacts and to enable conditions to be discharged for parts of the scheme to facilitate the sequencing of the approval of further details and construction.

3. Protection of retained trees and other vegetation during the construction period

No work of any kind shall take place within a work phase approved under condition 2 until the Local Planning Authority has approved in writing for that work phase the location and design of protective fences in accordance with BS5837 for trees and other vegetation to be retained and the approved protective fencing details have been erected. The Local Planning Authority shall be given not less than two weeks prior written notice by the developer of the commencement of works on the site in order that the council may verify in writing that the approved tree protection measures are in place when the work commences. The approved fence(s) shall be in place before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought on to the site for the purposes of the development and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Within the fenced area(s) there shall be no scaffolding, no stockpiling of any materials or soil, no machinery or other equipment parked or operated, no traffic over the root system, no changes to the soil level, no excavation of trenches, no site huts, no fires lit, no dumping of toxic chemicals and no retained trees shall be used for winching purposes. If any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the council.

Reason: To protect the retained trees and other vegetation from damage during construction and in recognition of the contribution which the retained trees and vegetation give and will continue to give to the amenity and ecology of the area.

4. Use and supply of construction materials

Prior to the commencement of development a written scheme shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority that sets targets for the use and supply of materials including

a Volume of materials from reclaimed or recycled material for use in the permanent works

b Volume of bulk fill and sub-base material specified and used in the project from previously used material

- c Use of locally sourced materials
- d Replacing primary aggregates with secondary aggregates
- e Very low levels of waste material generated to landfill
- f Surplus materials given to adjacent construction projects

Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the LPA the development shall achieve the approved targets and prior to opening to the public of the last defined work phase a verification report shall be submitted to the LPA confirming that the targets have been met.

Reason: To minimise waste, maximise recycling of material in order to minimise energy and natural resource use.

5. CEEQUAL

No development shall take place until written evidence has been received by the Local Planning Authority that the scheme will be assessed for a CEEQUAL Whole Team Award and that the scheme is capable of achieving an award of VERY GOOD. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority the development shall achieve the award and prior to opening to the public of the last defined work phase a report shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority verifying that the award has been met.

Reason: To ensure that the development contributes to mitigating and adapting to climate change and to meeting targets to reduce carbon dioxide emissions and use of natural resources.

6. Site specific construction environmental management plan

In relation to the control of pollution and minimisation of harm to the local areas and wildlife during the construction stage of the development and beyond:

i) No development shall take place within an identified work phase as approved under condition 2 until a site specific Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) for that phase has been prepared, submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority

ii) The CEMP must demonstrate the adoption and use of best practicable means to reduce the effects of noise, vibration, dust and other air borne pollutants and site lighting and include but not necessarily be limited to the following:

1. Procedures for maintaining good public relations including complaint management, public consultation and liaison

2. Strategy for dealing with contamination including the arrangements for dealing with contamination not expected or planned for within the strategy and a soil sampling methodolgy for material to be used in public areas.

3. Arrangements for liaison with the Local Planning Authority's Pollution Control Team and on site presence to enable appropriate responses to matters such as unforeseen contamination

4. The employment of an Environmental Clerk of Works

5. All works and ancillary operations which are audible at the site boundary, or at such other place as may be agreed with the Local Planning Authority, shall be carried out only between the hours of 08 00 Hours and 18 00 Hours on Mondays to Fridays and 08 00 and 13 00 Hours on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays and Bank Holidays. Any activity audible at the site boundary or other places agreed in the CEMP outside the hours above require prior approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Approval will only be given for works necessary due to exceptional circumstances, health and safety, dewatering operations or unavoidable works including works relating to the railway. In all cases the best practicable means to reduce noise to the lowest possible level will need to be demonstrated for approval

6. Green travel Plan to include proposals for the sustainable movement and routing of construction traffic to the site: parking by construction personnel to ensure that movements and deliveries to, and removal of plant, equipment, machinery and waste from the site must only take place in a sustainable way and within the permitted hours or exceptions to be detailed under point 5 above; proposals to provide and encourage alternatives to the use of single occupancy car journeys by personel such as contract buses and cycle parking.

7. Mitigation measures as defined in BS 5528: Parts 1 and 2 : 2009 Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open Sites shall be used to minimise noise disturbance from construction works.

8. Procedures for emergency deviation of the agreed working hours.

9. The use of a 'Considerate Contractors' or similar regime and arrangements for site induction for workforce highlighting pollution prevention and awareness.

10. Control measures for dust and other air-borne pollutants include particular measures to protect any local resident who may have a particular susceptibility to air-borne pollutants.

11. Measures for controlling the use of site lighting whether required for safe working or for security purposes.

12. Site Security

13. Fuel oil storage, bunding, delivery and use and how both minor and major spillage will be dealt with

14. Containment of silt/soil contaminated run off, the control and removal of spoil and wastes and disposal of contaminated drainage, including water pumped from excavations and leachate from ditch drainage

15. The treatment and removal of suspended solids from surface water run-off during construction works and measures to prevent building material finding its way into a watercourse

16. Odour control measures

17. Measures for the prevention of tracking mud off site from vehicles

18. Proposals for the temporary stockpiling of soil and spoil and proposals for the testing of soils to be used in soft landscaping areas for contamination.

19. All site clearance and construction works to be in accordance with the Environmental statement Volume 2, Chapter 2.13 Ecological Impact Assessment July 2013.

20. Measures to protect badgers from being trapped in open excavations and/or pipes and culverts

21 Arrangements for briefing contractors and sub-contractors on the importance of the ecological features which are to be retained on site and the ecological value of the SNCIs in particular.

iii) the approved CEMP shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent and minimise nuisance, harm to the environment and pollution

7. To ensure implementation of a programme of archaeological works

No development shall take place within a work phases agreed under condition 2 until the applicant/developer has secured for that phase the implementation of a programme of

archaeological work, to include geophysical survey, archaeological excavation and watching brief, in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted by the developer and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The scheme of investigation shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:

1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording

2. The programme for post investigation assessment

3. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording

4. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation

5. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation

6. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.

Reason: To ensure that archaeological remains and features are recorded prior to their destruction.

8. To secure the conduct of a watching brief during development groundworks

The applicant/developer shall ensure that all groundworks, including geotechnical works, are monitored and recorded by an archaeologist or an archaeological organisation to be approved by the council and in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under another condition attached to this permission.

Reason: To record remains of archaeological interest before destruction.

9. Submission of full design details including variations

For each work phase approved under condition 2 detailed drawings of the following aspects of the scheme numbered i-viii shall be submitted as a single coordinated submission and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the works approved in that work phase are begun;

i. all hard landscaping (including paving, surfaces, edge details, Brook Gate parking area, kerbing to minimise visual impacts on Highridge Common)

ii. soft landscaping showing existing planting to be retained and new planting (including species, planting sizes, planting densities, planting soils, planting pits and staking, root barriers to enable planting to carried out in close proximity to underground services, flood retention ponds, ground and earth modelling)

iii. street furniture and equipment, (including, signals, control equipment and signage) iv. street lighting (including a lighting level contour plan to assess light spill impacts on ecology)

v. bus stop infrastructure (that will be in accordance with the Visual Identity Guidelines submitted with the planning application)

vi. noise fences

vii. boundary fences and treatments to the reserve corridor between Queens Road and Hareclive Road and at Brook Gate

viii. Surface water drainage, based on sustainable drainage principles, including proposals for how this will be maintained and managed after completion and

in drawings submitted to satisfy this condition the following amendments to the drawings submitted with the application shall be made:

1. Removal of proposed trees to the west of the road between chainage 2700 and 3000 and their relocation in positions to be agreed under this condition to the east of the road between chainage 2700 and 2800

2. Relocation of pubic footpath diversion route between chainage 1440 and 1510 to run mid- way between Colliters Brook and SBL and the introduction of ground modelling and soft landscape to screen the adjoining highway retaining structure

3. Extension of off carriageway shared cycling and walking route from Cater Road roundabout to tie up with Malago Greenway

4. Cycle/footway connections across Whitland Road open space to link Whiteland Road to Lidl supermarket crossing and SBL shared cycle/footway.

5. All cycle/footway paths junctions to incorporate a minimum radii of xm.

6. Proposals to prevent grass verge car parking in King Georges Road

7. Additional tree planting where underground services and access requirements permit to the north, south and centre of the road between Lidl supermarket and Cater Road roundabout

8. Redesign of triangular area to the south of Lidl Supermarket to provide a formal design of hard and soft landscape so as to create a recognisable formal space associated with the proposed and existing bus stops and pedestrian routes through the area.

9. Additional planting on the boundary with Waverley Gardens

10. Retention or direct nearby replacement of trees T40-42.

11. Additional hedge planting on north side between chainage 2660-2710

Unless alternative times for implementation are otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the plans approved under this condition prior to the first use of any part of the road by the public with the exception that planting may be carried out no later than during the first planting season following the first use of any part of the use of the road by the public. All retained and newly planted materials shall be maintained for ten years from the first use of any part of the road by the public and any trees or plants removed, dying, being damaged or becoming diseased within that period shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

The acoustic fences and approved sustainable urban drainage shall be retained in an effective condition therafter.

Reason: To ensure a coordinated design of the elements identified so as to ensure the satisfactory appearance and functioning of the development, in the interest of minimising noise impact and in the interests of the ecology of Highridge Common and elsewhere

10. Flood compensation

No development shall take place within an identified work phase approved under condition 2 until a detailed scheme for flood compensation for that phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include further detailed hydraulic modelling within that phase to ensure the current agreed SBL flood risk infrastructure is sufficient.

Reason: To ensure that the development is served by a satisfactory system of flood compensation in order to manage flood risk.

11. Malago Culvert

No development shall commence within any of the phases approved under condition 2 that includes the Malago culvert until the detailed design of the highway crossing over the Malago

culvert has been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The detailed design must include a ground investigation with structural and loading calculations. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the details approved.

Reason: To prevent increased flood risk by ensuring the structural condition of the existing flood relief tunnel is retained.

12. Highridge Common ecology mitigation

Prior to the commencement of development within a work phases approved under condition 2 that includes Highridge Common or the common exchange land a specific ecological mitigation plan for the Highridge Common SNCI, that will be in accordance with the Environmental statement Volume 2, Chapter 2.13 Ecological Impact Assessment July 2013, shall be approved by the LPA that sets out in detail :

1. protection measures to minimise damage to the common during construction

2. a methodology for the translocation or turves to the common exchange land

3. proposals and methodology for the reinstatement of areas of grass land affected by the construction of the road that are returned to grass land on the existing common

4. proposals, methodology and monitoring arrangements for the establishment of the common exchange land during the period from the commencement of development to 10 years following the opening of the new road across the common

5. proposed management and maintenance regime thereafter.

The approved ecological mitigation plan shall be carried out in full unless any variations are agreed in writing with the LPA

Reason: In order to achieve sufficient ecological compensation for the loss of areas of the Highridge Common SNCI.

13. Further details of Bird and Bat boxes before relevant element started

For each works phase approved under condition 2 detailed drawings showing the location and design of bird and bat boxes for each work phase shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the relevant part of work is begun. The detail thereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with that approval prior to the opening of the road to the public for that phase.

Reason: In the interests of nature conservation.

Pre occupation condition(s)

14. To ensure completion of a programme of archaeological works

The use of the road by the public shall not take place until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under another condition attached to this permission and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

Reason: To ensure that archaeological remains and features are recorded and published prior to their destruction.

15. Landscape Management Plan For areas not including Highridge Common or the common exchange land a landscape Management Plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and

maintenance schedules for all landscape areas, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first use of any part of the use of the road by the public. The landscape management plan shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: To prevent losses, damage and to achieve the earliest possible establishment of the landscape and its retention in the interests of the character and appearance of the development.

List of approved plans

16. List of approved plans and drawings The development shall conform in all aspects with the plans and details shown in the application as listed below, unless variations are agreed by the Local Planning Authority in order to discharge other conditions attached to this decision. Reason: For the avoidance of doubt

> L 320 001P Site Plan Number 1, received 8 July 2013 L 320 002 P Site Plan Number 2, received 8 July 2013 L 320 003 P Site Plan Number 3, received 8 July 2013 L 320 004 P Site Plan Number 4, received 8 July 2013 L 320 005 P Site Plan Number 5, received 8 July 2013 L 320 006 P Site Plan Number 6, received 8 July 2013 L 320 D Red line whole scheme, received 8 July 2013 730/HIG/113 PA Scheme layout Drawings 4 of 5, received 8 July 2013 730/HIG/122 PA Plan and profile 3 of 10, received 8 July 2013 730/HIG/123 PA Plan and profile 4 of 10, received 8 July 2013 730/HIG/125 PA Plan and profile 6 of 10, received 8 July 2013 730/HIG/126 PA Plan and profile 7 of 10, received 8 July 2013 730/HIG/127 PA Plan and profile 8 of 10, received 8 July 2013 730/HIG/128 PA Plan and profile 9 of 10, received 8 July 2013 730/HIG/129 PA Plan and profile 10 of 10, received 8 July 2013 730/HIG/137 PA Cross-sections 3 of 5, received 8 July 2013 730/HIG/138 PA Cross-sections 4 of 5, received 8 July 2013 730/HIG/139 PA Cross-sections 5 of 5, received 8 July 2013 730/LAN/509 PA Landscape sections reserved corridor, received 8 July 2013 730/LAN/511 PA Landscape sections context, received 8 July 2013 730/LAN/512 PA King Georges Road typical detailed area and section, received 8 July 2013 730/LAN/523 PA Landscape proposals 4 of 5, received 8 July 2013 7300/LAN/524 PA Landscape proposals 5 of 5, received 8 July 2013 730/HIG/111 PA Scheme layout drawings 2 of 5, received 8 July 2013 730/LAN/114/PA Landscape proposals 5 of 5, received 8 July 2013 730/HIG/114 PA Scheme layout drawings 5 of 5, received 8 July 2013 Visual identity guide, received 8 July 2013 Chapter 13 Ecology, received 8 July 2013 730/LAN/521 PA Landscape proposals 2 of 5, received 8 July 2013

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

Advices

1 Heat and ICT networks

The applicant is advised to liaise with Bristol CC Strategic Energy Unit and Future Cities to maximise opportunities to incorporate and coordinate heat network and ITC network infrastructure within the road construction.

2 Nesting birds

Anyone who takes, damages or destroys the nest of any wild bird whilst that nest is in use or being built is guilty of an offence under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and prior to commencing work you should ensure that no nesting birds will be affected.

- 3 Under the Water Resources Act 1991 and the Land Drainage Act 1991 both the Environment Agency and the Local Authority have permissive powers to maintain watercourses. Their jurisdiction depends on the watercourse designation as "Main River" or "Ordinary Watercourse". Responsibility for general maintenance of the watercourses and their banks rests with riparian owners. Flood Defence Consent from the Environment Agency will be required for any work in, over, under or within 8 metres of the top of bank of the Main Rivers
- 4 The Environmental Statement details the presence of Japanese knotweed and Himalayan balsam in the site area, and that this will need to be treated. The applicant should be aware that eradication of both plants can take a number of years. For information approval from the Environment Agency is required for use of herbicides near water. Further advice to available through the following link:

http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/wildlife/31350.aspx

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Pollution Control Transport Development Management, City Transport Environment Agency (Sustainable Places) Archaeology Team North Somerset District Council Wessex Water **Bristol Water Okc English Heritage** Natural England Environment Agency (Sustainable Places) Crime Reduction Unit Network Rail Air Quality Arboricultural Team Nature Conservation Officer (Bristol City Council) Economic Development Landscape Healthy Living & Health Improvement Sustainable Projects Bristol Water Okc Contaminated Land Environmental Protection Mrs Sue Newman Mr Roger Key Reactive Building and Maintenance Limited Ryan Furse Reflex IT Systems Ltd Stephen Warner Mr Robert Craig

Mrs Christine Johnson Mrs R Sutcliffe Ms Angela Maddick Mr Phil Hutchings - Petition Miss Kay Bertwistle Mrs Anne Simmons Mrs Ruth Bowering Mr Robert Griffin Mr Mike Ginger Mrs Lorna Holdom Mrs Margot Hodgson Mr Clifford Bond Mrs Hazel Hill Mrs Debbie Nicholls Mr Dan Durie Mrs Carol Searle Mrs Annabel Durie **Business West Julie Lever** Mr Keith Hicks Mrs Rosamond Robbins Mr Neil Smith Mr Martin McDonnell Ms Pip Sheard Mr Robert Mckenzie Mrs Carol Tilley Mr Robert Dixon Mr Antony Parsons Mr Anthony Whittington Mr Andy Robbins Mr & Mrs Pete and Ann Goodwin Mr Martin Boddy Mr Patrick Finch A P Wholesale Supplies Alison Hatcher Mr Sean Longsdale Wincanton Eddie Morton Oak Tree Mobility Tom Powell Mr Andy McBride-Coogan Mr Ben Heald Mrs A Hinderson **Race Completions Limited Peter White** D. Redgswell And I. P. Beckey Phil Hutchings Hartcliffe Motor Company David Downs Medina Dairy Ltd Santosh Reddy Ettem Mr Rob Flower Ms Deborah Blackmore **Business Improvement District David James & Partners** Mr I Horrell TH Scaffolding Limited Lee Holliday Laurie Read Mr D J Ball Francis James Greensides Miss Louise Dutton

Ms Karen Patchell Mr Mike Sheehan Mr Mike Sheehan **Robbins Timber Richard Bagnall** Mr Paul Mizen Mr Martyn Rundle Mr Paul Musgrove Mr Martin Allen Mr Keith Hallett Hands Off Long Ashton Mr Michael Parsons Scaffolding 4 MGB Limited Gemma Bradshaw Stuart Cleland, Bristol Water Mr John Bateman Cllr Rob Telford Wessex Flyer Ian King Mr Jon Redish Mr Tony Mosely Mr Jonathan Bradley Mr David Shulver Mr Keith Way Mr P Williams Mr Douglas Wheeler Mr Kenneth Simmons Mr Stephen Parnell Mrs Victoria Coyne Dr Rod Sterland **Miss Elaine Leslie** MR Stephen Jeremy Bristow Mrs Maralyn Radice Academic & Technical Typesetting Alan Bond Ms Liz Price Advantage 4 Vans Jason Howell Mr Mike Knight (South Bristol Business) Stuart Taylor - Tile Giant Mr J. M. Donaw - Store Manager, Iceland Emma Collins - Full House Cafe Mrs Pauline Tovey - Manager Of Boots The Chemist Leanne Davis - Argos Karl M Williams, Store Manager Of Peacocks Rob Podger, Chew Valley Chamber Of Commerce Spencer Henley Mrs N. New R Loward The Occupier Mrs Susan Cox Mrs Jo Pollitt Mrs Helen Price Mr Chris Miles Mr Mark Coleman Mr Tom McCarthy S Williams Mr And Mrs Stephen And Ann Knowlson Mr Richard Bevan

K Jennings N. J. Sillo **Kiely Hill** Mr Gary Jacobs A P Parbett The Occupier **RBM Supplies Matthew Furse** Mark Stewart, Airbus The Occupier Miss Charlotte Vowles Miss Tracey Penberthy The Occupiers Mr And Mrs Nick And Mary Walker Mrs Tracey Green The Occupier The Occupier Mr George Chandler Mr Andrew Bennett **Charlotte And Steve Johns** Mrs G Lax Mr Thomas Kennedy **Cllr Mark Brain** Ms Anne Upton Mr Paul Steventon-Smith Mr Andrew Collins Mrs Lauriel Fitzgerald Dr Phil Jackson Mrs Kathryn Jackson William LeVaillant Mr Mike Henry Ms Sheila Hardingham Mrs Debbie Nicholls Mr Jon Clark - Forest Of Avon Trust Mrs Christine Wilmot Ms Bridget Newbery Mrs Zennor Box Mr Peter Kydd Advanced Modular Roofing Systems (SW) Ltd Robert Shaw Mrs Ann Fay Hanford Construction Ltd Christopher Hanson Mrs Alison Langan Mr Robert Shore Mr Nigel Stoneman Robert Giles Philip Hill, Bishop And Kings Group Sustrans Malago Conservation Group Mrs Sally Milkins Rebecca Gunson Mrs Dawn Cole Mrs Lesley Sage M J Sautelt The Occupier G. W. Bond

A Dean **BW Chalmers** J R Budd Mr Daniel Froud Ms Claire Chipperfield Mr Christopher Sleap **Quadron Quadron Bristol** Mr Philippe Porcel Mr Philip Hill Melvin Clark (Withywood Community Forum & Park Group) Mr Joe Moore Mr Paul Giannetto Mr Gordon Colburn K. J. And J. Jennings K. E. Fletcher Mr And Mrs D J And I E Butler The Occupier Mrs Deborah Nicholson Miss louise Lalonde Mr James Hunt Mr Andy Pelkiewicz Mr Gavin Smith Mr Andrew Maclean J. And M. Windows Wring Builders Merchant **Discount Carpets' Dennis Lane Bristol Airport** Mrs Patricia Kabala Mrs Wendy Roberts Andrew Baker Ms Lucy Neale Mr Derek Ford Mr M J Baker Mrs Heather Leeson Bristol Civic Society Mr Sean Hegarty Mr Richard Griffin Mr Michael Knight Mr Andrew Cook Mr Paul Cook Mr Nicholas Kerswell **Backwell Parish Council** Ms Carole Leslie Mrs Gay Leslie Brissco (Equipment) Ltd Philip Pope Morplan Ltd Rob Davis Miss Helen Young Mr Nigel Moorcroft Mr Neil Watson Mr John Glew Mr Bill Roberts Mr Nicholas Walker Sue Flint Mr Timothy Winsland Ms Danila Giannetto

Mr Christopher Bloor Mr Stjohn Williams S Whittler Mr M Horder S P Johns A.j. Cox Maria K Bennett Mr Jason Paish Mr Adrian Webber Caroline Harvey Mr Guy Price (Bristol City FC) Mr Phil Edmonds, Gemsec Mr Brian Condon The Occupier The Occupier The Occupier Ms Marie Jenkins The Occupier Mr David Williams Mr And Mrs Christopher And Giselle Wall Mrs Anne Gates Mr Eric Gates Mrs. Mary Magro Mrs Keren Knighton Mrs Carol Smart David And Angela Neale Mr Charles Critchett Tom Selway - President Of Bristol Junior Chamber Mr Ian Webb The Occupier Mr Claudio Archer Ms Helen McCarthy Mr Tony Homer Mrs H. Jarrett **Ben Ponting** Ms Jonanna Van Tonder Joe Evans James Durie Sian Berry Mr Richard Pole Malago Valley Conservation Group Mr & Mrs M Mitchell Mrs Janet Sedan Mr Terry Hieron Penny And Martin Bird Ms Amanda Johnston Ms Elaine Weaver Dr Marcus Witt John Hirst, Destination Bristol Mr Stephen Rose Mr Andrew Thompson Mr Philip Hill Mr And Mrs G Garland Mr & Mrs Michael & Clare Costigan

Green Mr R Buxton Mr David Rayfield Mr Nigel Harper Mr Tim Sterling Mr Mike Landen Mr Giles Manning Dr Karen Low Mr Paul Windows Managing Director Paul Matthews Mrs Emma Smart Mr Joel Hughes Mrs Robyn Silwal Ms Moira Hunt Mr Clive Stevens Mrs Charlotte Johns Mr Kevin Vans-Colina Mrs Patricia Kabala **Richard Hall** Mr J. C. Edwards Miss Lindsey Scott **R.S And J.R Burnell** Cllr Dr David Willingham Mr Peter Floyd Ms Merilyn Holme Dr Robert Johnson Mr Paul Vowles Mr Michael Shaw Mrs Suzan Ashby Dr Bryan Carroll Miss Linda Manfield Ms Natasha Mckenzie Andy Lawton (Lawton Brothers Scaffolding) Andy Lawton (Lawton Brothers Scaffolding) Miss V Williams Mr Phil Dunning Mrs Kirsten Durie Mr Derek Maltby Mr Thomas Hack Mr Harvey Lilley **BCH** Properties Jason Howell Mr Azhar Butt Mr Tom Gibbons Mrs Carolyn Sheehan Dr Sarah Talbot Mr Lee Winter Mr & Mrs Noel & Suzanne O'Donnell Chief Executive Matthew Tanner Janet Turp Southwest Upholstery Ryan Ball Mr Richard Dixon Design Scaffolding (Bristol) Limited John Boyce Howdens Howden Joinery Graham Mcdougall Showcardprint Nigel Ryan

Mr Jonathan Hill Mr Mark O'Callaghan Mrs Wendy Pearson M & M Deliveries Bristol Ltd Steve Veale Poplar Insulation Ltd Blaine Nolan Middleton Mobility Rick Towler Dr Charlotte Uhlenbroek Mrs Sally Sterland GeMech Ltd John Garner Mr Martvn Jones **Dorothy Brown** Mr Paul Grant Mr William Weir Mr Stephen Tilley Mr Anthony Butcher X-tra Space Ltd Chris Howe Mr John Chapman Mr Mark Williett Mr G Warden Corporate Responsibility Manager Philippa Hadfield Ms Judy Giannetto Mr Tim Waite The Occupier The Occupier Mr And Mrs M Edwards Mrs S Smith A Bundy The Occupier J A Kelson The Occuiper K Burt C A Florence The Occupier **R** Hurlev P I Williams The Occupier The Occupier The Occupier R. Read The Occupier J M Parrell The Occupier The Occupier **Rosemary Thorne** The Occupier Dr Ann Parkinson Mr Nigel Sommerville Colin Wragg Mr Andrew Forbes

commdelgranted V1.0211