

Para/policy/page	Comment	Possible conformity issue?	OMQF Response
Page 3	Stephen Williams MP is now DCLG Minister		Noted.
Page 9	Map title could seem negative by emphasising area's isolation – and boundary of Quarter is not shown.		The title on the plan is precisely the point. Boundary should be added.
	Copyright on aerial photo?		Consider drawn plan rather than aerial photograph or lighter.
	Check copyright throughout.		
1.3 2 nd para.	Not clear what point is being made in second sentence. Evidence suggests that BME population is much higher in Quarter than Bristol average.		Look at table for OMQ/Bristol comparison.
1.3 2 nd para. 6 th bullet	Is there evidence to support resident profile being 'young professional'?		Local knowledge.
1.3 2 nd bullet 7 th bullet	Is there any evidence to support 'hidden demand'?		Remove the word 'hidden'.
1.4 1 st para.	It would be helpful to clarify role of 'high street', what is meant by the term in this context. Local centre is also used elsewhere.		'High Street' is Old Market Street and West Street.
	What evidence is being used to support approach to retail?		Existing retailers - largely independent specialist shops.
	Definition of third sector could be helpful.		Third sector is charities and voluntary organisations - offices/shops/centres, etc.
1.4 2 nd para.	Suggest either explain PIWA or just say 'industrial areas', as this is a descriptive section.		Substitute 'industrial areas' for PIWAs as suggested.
1.4 4 th para.	Paragraph seems out of place. Appears to be more suited to plan introduction or foreword		Move as suggested.
2.1	Challenges section is quite negative and even suggests problems that could seem insurmountable to those not familiar with the area. Perhaps opportunities could be put first and challenges could be presented a way which does not overemphasise specific issues.		Reorder and rename sections 'strengths', 'weaknesses', 'opportunities' and 'threats'.
2.1 5 th bullet	Increasing residential population resulting from the new development is regarded as a positive elsewhere in the document. Why is completed residential development presented as a challenge? More explanation would be helpful.		This would be renamed as a 'weakness'.
2.2 2 nd bullet	Consistency – 'many residents who have lived in the area all their lives' – Section 1.3 says small number have		Change 'many' to 'some'.

Para/policy/page	Comment	Possible conformity issue?	OMQF Response
	lived here all their lives		
2.2 4 th bullet	Appears out of place. More consistent with a foreword. Is the opportunity the fact that there is an engaged and active community?		Move as suggested.
2.2 5 th bullet	Does it add to the preconceptions to suggest there are preconceptions about crime? Perhaps just be clear that it has a low crime rate (supported by evidence).		Evidence? People unfamiliar with the area would be surprised that it has a low crime rate.
2.2 8 th bullet	Is it not already a great place to live? More explanation would be helpful.		Not 'great' yet!
2.2 10 th bullet	Second sentence does not read very clearly.		Agreed.
2.2 12 th bullet	Explanation of infrastructure assets may be useful.		Description is a bit mixed up.
Section 3	This section would benefit from clarification about the role of a Neighbourhood Development Plan. See comments on the projects section below. It would be helpful to discuss this further at the meeting. References to new community council etc. may be inconsistent with the role of NDPs as set out in NPPF and regulations		
Page 15	It would be helpful for the plan area to be shown at an earlier stage.		Agreed.
5. 3 rd para	Typo – café's		Noted.
6.3 1 st para	High Street – local centre. Clarification of aims would be helpful, with reference to evidence.		
6.3 2 nd para	Is reference to 'young professional' excluding of other young people?		
7. 2 nd para.	This might replicate earlier parts of document and could be clearer in explaining the status of the NDP.		
Page 23	Diagram only covers a small part of the NDP area. It might be helpful to clarify the focus on that particular area.		Agreed - needs title.
	Reference to 'rules' is incorrect. Should read 'policies'.		Agreed change 'rules' to 'policies'.
8.	Most of the Projects section sets out very detailed proposals for the highway. These cannot be delivered by the development plan and could not be implemented through decisions on planning applications. It would be helpful to discuss this section at the meeting on 17 th December.	Potentially covers matters that cannot be delivered through the NDP.	We must disagree totally with this. The highway projects are high up on the list of the local community's aspirations.
Page 31	See above – and includes land outside the NP designated area.	Proposals for land outside the NP boundary cannot	This is setting the highway scheme into context. Removal of Lawrence Hill roundabout (outside NDP area) is again high on the wish list.

Para/policy/page	Comment	Possible conformity issue?	OMQF Response
		be included.	
Page 35	The Policies Map is not comprehensive and is unclear in respect of some designations. Its purpose does not seem to be clearly explained. Proposals for land outside the NP boundary are included.	Proposals for land outside the NP boundary cannot be included.	Some policies can't be shown on a map and others may be better not shown on a map. Perhaps the title of the map should be changed.
Policy T1	It is not clear how development mitigates against the impact of vehicular traffic. More explanation would be helpful.		Perhaps we should change 'mitigate' to 'reduce'.
Policy T2	It would not be clear to applicants how the development was expected to enhance the pedestrian experience etc. More explanation would be helpful.		?
Policy T3	The approach seems inconsistent with the references to Gardiner Haskins, so clarification might be helpful.		Existing 'off street' parking on business premises should not be lost. 'On street' parking should not be reduced.
	The requirement for cycle stands is unclear – how many stands?		Bicycle parking in line with BCC parking.
	Residential development could reduce short term parking – is the policy intended to apply to such schemes?		
	Short term parking would benefit from definition.		Short term 1 hour or 2 hours maximum.
Page 37	It may be helpful to show the potential routes which are proposed more boldly than the existing which are already there. The new proposed routes should be shown on the Policies Map as Policy T1 refers to them.		Map is clearer on drawn OS rather than aerial photograph.
Policy B1	Reference to ownership boundaries could be confusing. Such boundaries may not be appropriate for shaping development.		Omit the word 'ownership'.
	Second sentence - may also wish to consider character of the wider area		
Page 39	The map may be more appropriately located in a separate evidence document.		
	The map gives a very negative impression by identifying around two thirds of the Quarter as comprising negative buildings. Numerous homes are described as negative, as are industrial buildings located within a primarily industrial context.		This map is showing buildings' architectural quality. It is not showing the 'usefulness' of the building. It is the map in the Conservation Area Character Appraisal, expanded to cover the whole NDP area.
Policy B2	1 st bullet is unclear		Building line is the junction of the back of pavement (public) and buildings/building plots/gardens (private). It needs to be defined by facades of buildings/boundary walls that are substantial (not just a line in the paving).
Policy B4	Some elements of the policy could be seen as onerous		It is meant to be onerous. We have put it in as the existing

Para/policy/page	Comment	Possible conformity issue?	OMQF Response
	or inflexible – altered fenestration and ground floor retail (the latter would be covered by other policies)		BCC policies have failed to protect the area and caused deterioration of the buildings that are in the public realm.
	Requirement for detailed building survey is unlikely to be reasonable in most cases.		The council's planning application validation procedures ask for drawings of buildings as existing. Such drawings are useless if they are not accurate.
9.2.5 2 nd para.	The meaning of this paragraph is not clear.		Agreed.
Policy B5	The policy refers to the redevelopment of sites in PIWAs for residential uses. This is inconsistent with the Core Strategy. Policy and explanation should not be included.	Not in conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan.	This is not contrary to emerging policies both in the 'Public Realm and Movement Framework' document (ref. p.43, 7E) and BCAP Preferred Options Consultation (ref. p.62 policy BCAP46 para. 4).
Policy C1	Policy may benefit from greater explanation and reference to evidence.		?
Policy C2	The minimum size of supermarket is fairly limited. Is that the intention? It might be helpful to be clear on what size of supermarket is sought. Is it the intention that the supermarket is anywhere within the Quarter? What evidence is being used to consider the approach to convenience shopping?	Possibly not in conformity with strategic policies for retail development which direct development to centres.	Supermarket size relates to the scheme for the Seed Warehouse site that was granted planning permission on 23 rd September 2009 but now lapsed; it is included in policy C5. The size is equivalent to the Sainsburys on Broad Quay. Community consultation has highlighted a need for an independent supermarket.
	What type or scale of community space is sought?		Community space – list or definition required.
	Is there evidence to support desire for a health centre.		Health centre - need identified by members of community. Need to check existing capacity in Lawrence Hill Surgery.
Policy C3	This sets out a different approach to larger homes than in BCAP. Is there evidence to support a need for four bedroom properties?		I don't see that the policy is inconsistent with BCAP3. Evidence comes from BCC Housing Dept.
	The policy may be unclear and difficult to implement in practice.		I still think we should state a proportion of 3+ bedroom properties as St Paul SPD.
9.3.4	It would be helpful to be clear about which site is which. A reference for each distinct site could assist.		It seems quite clear to me when you go onto C4 to C10.
Policy C4 7 th bullet	Approach to parking is unclear ('or better' – is this more or less parking?). This appears in other allocations.		Reword as 'at a minimum ratio of 1 space per 2 dwellings'.
Policy C4 10 th bullet	Supermarket proposal a little detached from main frontages. It would be helpful to discuss this further.	Possibly not in conformity with strategic policies	The idea of a supermarket on this site comes from agents advising the site owner – DMPG.
Policy C6 7 th bullet	Reference to accommodation associated with the mosque is not clear		This site is ideal for expansion of the Mosque.
Policy C7	The site for the proposed development is very narrow in parts and may be liable to have an overbearing impact on homes in Hayes Close and Hassell Drive. There		It can be designed so that there is minimal impact on the backs (? fronts) of houses in Hayes Close. Yes some trees will be lost, but some will be kept; in the green areas on the

Para/policy/page	Comment	Possible conformity issue?	OMQF Response
	would also be a significant loss of mature trees and it is possible that the existing landscaped area may be regarded as an amenity by local residents. It would be interesting to see results of consultation in this area.		diagram. The Ashley, Easton and Lawrence Hill Area Green Space Plan states that the land is "of poor recreational design and value" and "it may be better to 'swap' the space for another". Note back of new development is on the line of the back of existing footpath along Clarence Road - which is significantly narrowed.
Policy C9	Site appears to currently provide a green landscape feature in the area. If developed the site should be used for industrial and warehousing purposes to be consistent with the Core Strategy.	Possible conformity issue with strategic policies.	The site in the PIWA is vacant. No reason why it has to be purely industrial. Emerging policies loosen the restrictions of development in PIWAs see B5 above.
Policy C10 Ambulance Station	The proposals for new public open space on the site adjacent to the ambulance station are not consistent with the BCAP. The Ambulance Station is a strategic site within the BCAP and the Neighbourhood Plan should not include a policy for it.	Not in conformity with BCAP	The BCAP is not in conformity with the NDP! The ambulance station site should be taken out of the BCAP and put into the NDP. It is within the agreed NDP boundary.
Policy C10 Waterloo Road	Part of the PIWA.	Not in conformity with Core Strategy unless it relates to uses referred to in Core Strategy Policy BCS8.	As comment on Policy C9.
9.3.5	There does not appear to be evidence that many of the long term sites are likely to be available for development, even in the longer term e.g. Gardiner Haskins car park. The identification of long term sites in the PIWA area is not supported by evidence of availability and does not conform with the Local Plan's policies.	Some proposals not in conformity with strategic policies.	There has to be some long term plan for the frontages to Midland Road, Gardiner Haskins' car park and the area next to the River Frome otherwise what is the point of a plan that looks forward to 2026.
9.3.5 Old Market Roundabout	The suggested contribution of the release of land in securing the engineering works does not seem to be supported by evidence.		Evidence in other cities, e.g. Nottingham Maid Marion Way.
9.3.5 Lawrence Hill Roundabout	This includes land outside the boundary of the plan. There does not seem to be any evidence as to whether development would be viable and whether it could viably fund reconfiguration and realignment.	Not appropriate to include land outside the plan boundary.	It would be relatively easy to cost a scheme to test the viability Why can't we look outside the designated area of the NDP? We could alter the NDP boundary as Redcliffe have done?
9.4	This section includes management proposals throughout that are unlikely to be appropriate for an NDP. It would be helpful to discuss this further at the meeting.		?
9.4.1	Policy appears to be out of sequence. E4 looks to retain trees of amenity value but Site C7 would result in loss.		Need to insist on replacement trees where development of sites causes trees to be lost.

Para/policy/page	Comment	Possible conformity issue?	OMQF Response	
	The policies should explain why loss of trees allowed for in some circumstances.			
9.4 St Matthias Park	Is it intended that New Street becomes a public open space – this is not clear from the plan. The existing fence may provide an important defensible feature for the space associated with the flats.		New Street remains as a street down to the New Street Flats where there would be a gateway into the park. Needs a drawing to explain what is proposed.	
9.4 Castle Park eastern entrance	See comments above.		Fundamental see response to C10.	
9.4 Newtown Park	Called Newtown Park in the text and Hassell Drive Open Space on the map. This may be unclear to plan users.		Late name change! Also needs explanatory drawing. Document needs to be checked for consistency.	
Appendix 1	Perhaps best to have design code and shopfront guide first as this related to the plans policies.		Agreed design code and shop front guide should come first.	
	Is Appendix 1 required to assist in understanding or implementing the policies?		App1 - Heritage Trail is there for information, maybe it should be dropped.	
Appendix 2	1.1 – is a little difficult to understand. Some clarifications may assist.		Seems clear enough.	
	1.3 – does this raise any safety and security issues? Have views of Police Architectural Liaison Officer been received?		Permeability is good, dead ends are not. We should consult police liaison officer.	
	2.1 – definition of historic ownership boundaries may be helpful. If there was a single landowner at some stage in the past this could cause confusion.		Change 'ownership' to 'plot' or omit word 'ownership'.	
	4.1 – the suggested restrictions on materials may be onerous considering the extent of the Quarter and its varied character. Are these proposals supported by evidence?		Evidence is there to see!	
	4.2 may sit uncomfortably with efforts to secure greener buildings. The implications across the Quarter should be carefully considered.		I don't see the problem I believe there is a fundamental misunderstanding in the planning department about 'green' buildings. We should be achieving reductions in carbon emissions without resorting to green bling, which is effectively what the sustainability policies call for (i.e. 20% betterment over building regulations by addition of 'on-site' renewable technologies).	
	5.1 is very unclear and matters of use are policy rather than design code issues.		}	Agreed these should go elsewhere and be incorporated into policies.
	5.2 may be considered unreasonably inflexible and should be addressed in policy sections rather than design code.			
5.3 Workshops are a policy rather than design code				

Para/policy/page	Comment	Possible conformity issue?	OMQF Response
	matter.		
	6.1 – Parking provision is a policy rather than design code matter. The BCAP allows for car free development in the city centre.		
	6.2 – this section would benefit from clarification.		
Appendix 3	The Council has policies for shopfronts and a practice note. It may be helpful to cross refer and to clarify which issues are particular to Old Market.		We want to make it simple and straightforward for people to understand (shop owners and tenants). The Guide is worded that way, but needs further editing/refining.
	1.2 – replace 'planning officers' with 'the Council' or 'the local planning authority'.		Agreed.
	8.1 The Council does not lay down regulations for conservation areas – but there are policies and guidelines. It would be helpful to clarify the source of these statements.		Needs rewording. The shop front guide is partly a reaction to the Council's inability to enforce their shop front policies, I think partly because the policies are too woolly, inconcise and not robust enough.
Other issues/ general points	It would be helpful to discuss whether policies such as B2 and B3 are to be used instead of the suite of design policies in the Local Plan, or in addition to them. This might affect the approach to wording.		NDP policies are to supplement BCC local plan policies.
	The plan period will need to be defined.		Agreed this will be up to 2026.