

Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan

APPENDIX 2

Comments Received from Pre-submission Consultation

	Sara Brooke-Taylor	Warwickshire Rural Community Council	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response.
1	<p>Response. Corrections required.</p> <p>4.3 "... does not to harm the openness of the Green Belt" - remove "to"?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Comma required after "housing" and before "employment"?</p> <p>Policy H2 - introductory sentence, who will decide what is reasonably adjacent? Core Strategy Policy CS.15 allows for local need schemes adjacent to settlements so I would suggest sticking with adjacent rather than reasonably adjacent.</p> <p>Although Policy H2 a) refers to "having regard to the latest Housing Needs Survey" this doesn't actually imply that it must be up-to-date. I would therefore suggest that either at 4.4 or at Policy H2 a) the term "up-to-date housing needs survey" is used.</p> <p>At 4.16 "born in the parish" is not included in the local connection definitions, though it is referred to in SDC's supplementary planning document "Local Choice - meeting the needs of Rural Communities". re the list of "housing commitments since 2011" (Section 4 Housing, pg 7). Presumably the two earlier applications (2007 and 2009) were approved pre April 2011 (before the Plan Period), so should not be included within the list? Already agreed to remove re. SDC submission</p>		<p>Amended</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>2 earlier applications removed from Plan</p>
2	Dr. G.N. Nicholson	Inland Waterways Association.	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
	<p>Response Policy NE 5 - Natural Environment</p> <p>The Inland Waterways Association (Warks branch) is happy to offer general support for your Village Neighbourhood Plan. Whilst the parish area only includes two very short stretches of the Stratford Canal on it's very boundaries, the IWA is always in favour of strong, well-conceived local plans to protect both the scenic quality of each area and the unique built environment which defines each village. The Stratford Canal is one of the most attractive canals in England and the vistas from it require as much protection as possible from untoward development and ugly or inappropriate design in order to maintain it's high tourist value and to remain an asset for the local community.</p>		<p>Response noted - no changes</p>

Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan

APPENDIX 2

Comments Received from Pre-submission Consultation

	Stewart Parnham	Resident
3	<p>Response Policy CSL 2 - Sports and Leisure Facilities</p> <p>I don't understand the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two thirds of residents (66%) felt that they would like to see floodlighting but it should be limited to turning off at 9pm. Six out of ten residents did not want to see floodlighting at all, whilst only 11% wanted unlimited floodlighting for sporting facilities. <p>4 thirds - how can this be?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan Survey Top line results showed these details at question 5c. The results are not relevant or reflected in the Neighbourhood Plan. It is perhaps because they were told to answer every question and those that did not want flood lighting may also have ticked to say if they had to have it they would accept till 9pm. The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group agree, the survey results do not add up</p>

Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan

APPENDIX 2

Comments Received from Pre-submission Consultation

5	<p>M. Thomas</p> <p>Resident Station Road CV35 8PE</p>	<p>Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response</p>
	<p>Response</p> <p><u>Appendix 2</u></p> <p>While in general agreement with many aspects of the Plan, we continue to be concerned at the statement on page 34 which states “the parish council will seek to obtain planning permission to build a car park adjacent to Claverdon Station,” and the 2012 plan which included a road running along the border of our property to the car park, situated adjacent to ours and two other properties. At the time, we were informed that “it would never happen,” but it continues to be referred to in plans, and just the presence in the 2012 plan and now the recent plan would have a considerable detrimental impact on the value of our property, and on our quality of life. The parish council seeking to obtain planning permission for the car park at the station, is a different stance from it never happening.</p> <p>We therefore want reference to the station car park removed from the current plan, and the map in the 2012 plan removed from the parish council website.</p> <p>There are a number of reasons why a car park should not go ahead –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no economic case for a station car park • The station is used by very few people • The few rail users walk to the station. They do not travel to the station by car or bicycle so do not need a car park. The lay-by opposite the station is rarely used by rail users. • There is no evidence that a station car park would increase the usage of the station • Stratford Council has no plans to propose a car park at Claverdon Station, as part of its travel strategy • Stratford Council’s transport strategy aims to encourage people to use active forms of travel instead of using cars, so is at odds with this proposal of a car park. • Current rail users drive to Stratford, Warwick Parkway and Stratford Parkway stations which have recently been developed or are being developed. Stratford, 	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan has been amended to read the following at Appendix 2.</p> <p>Car parking is an issue in Claverdon. The Parish Council support additional car park facilities adjacent to Claverdon Station if assurances can be obtained from the rail franchise holders for additional services from Claverdon to Stratford upon Avon and Leamington Spa, and there is no adverse harm to the amenity of local residents.</p>

Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan

APPENDIX 2

Comments Received from Pre-submission Consultation

Stratford Parkway and Warwick Parkway stations all have spare capacity.

- The station is too far away from Claverdon School to reduce traffic and parking demand during peak school travel periods around Claverdon School.
- The proposed car park does not provide a consolidation of car parking facilities in Claverdon or provide parking for users other than rail passengers.
- Claverdon Station does not provide an interchange for other transport links, whereas the Parkway services at Stratford and Warwick are serviced by road, cycle, bus and taxi links.
- The misuse of an unsupervised open car park has not been considered – vandals, theft from cars and the theft of cars, graffiti, skateboarding and rollerblading, unauthorized gypsy and traveller use, drugs, drag racing, wheel-spinning, unsupervised access to the rear of the three properties for thieves, litter, theft from payment machines / meters, and dogging. There is no logic in inviting these issues to the village.
- Access issues have not been considered – the 2012 proposal is for access off Station Road, from a 50 mph speed limit just over the brow of a hill, requiring the removal of oak trees with Preservation Orders, on green belt land which is currently used for agriculture, and which the parish council are keen to protect.
- It is not compatible with adjoining land uses.
- It appears that the inclusion of station car parking in both the 2012 plan and this draft plan, has been at the request of one person. There is no demand for the station car park from villagers. In the 2016 Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire, only two comments out of 52 comments said that they wanted a station car park (out of 539 properties surveyed and 259 returned responses). It has been included without consultation with those impacted by the proposal.
- The proposal for a station car park was discussed at the Neighbourhood Plan meeting in October 2016, where it stated, “Support car parking facilities adjacent to the Station, which could also encompass a small commercial development.” This development is not mentioned in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. There appears to be no other discussion of this matter in the minutes.
- We are concerned that those people proposing a station car park will go onto propose further commercial or residential developments once a car park is established.

Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan

APPENDIX 2

Comments Received from Pre-submission Consultation

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the desire of the proposed car park is to increase usage of the station, this would therefore increase traffic in the village, which has not been considered in the Neighbourhood Plan. • There are no details on the proposed facilities of the car park - floodlighting, security, onward taxi services, contacting taxi services (there is a very limited mobile signal in this part of Claverdon), and security issues. • The 2016 Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire made no reference to a proposed car park at the train station, so we were not given an opportunity to be consulted on the issue. 	

	Name	Address	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
6	Vincent Ford	Resident Park Close CV35 8 HH	<p>Response Policy H2 - Meeting Local Housing Needs</p> <p>Dear Sirs, Congratulations on an excellent and thorough assessment of I. As a newcomer to Claverdon, I am left with only one question on my mind, and that is - What is the actual estimate of the number of new homes that are to be built in the next 12 years and, because of the very tight village boundary, where would they be located? I assume this will be part of the next stage in the final plan, but it is very important to establish this criteria in order to plan in a comprehensive manner.</p>
7	Peter Boland	Historic England	<p>Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response</p>

Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan

APPENDIX 2

Comments Received from Pre-submission Consultation

<p>Response Policy BE 2 Designated Heritage Assets</p> <p>Historic England is supportive of both the content of the document and the vision and objectives set out in it.</p> <p>The emphasis on the conservation of local distinctiveness through good design and the protection of heritage assets and landscape character including important views is to be applauded, as is the earlier production of the Village Design Statement which will no doubt be invaluable as a context and evidence base for the current Plan.</p> <p>We do have one minor comment that you may wish to consider. That is that, as currently drafted, it is not clear whether Policy BE2 applies only to designated heritage assets (as the title of the policy suggests) or to all heritage assets, as the wording in the body of the policy indicates. The National Planning Policy Framework indicates that all heritage assets should be conserved in a manner proportionate to their significance. Historic England fully support that approach and we suggest that for the avoidance of doubt the Policy is simply entitled “Heritage Assets”.</p> <p>Overall the plan reads as a well-considered, concise and fit for purpose document which we consider takes a suitably proportionate approach to the historic environment of the Parish.</p> <p>I hope you find these comments and advice helpful</p>	<p>Accepted and “designated” has been removed from the appropriate places</p>
---	---

	Mrs. Shirley Reading	Resident - Church Road, CV35 8PB	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
8	<p>Response</p> <p>Please find below comments as to changes which require making to the Claverdon neighbourhood development plan to ensure its accuracy.</p> <p>Corrections for Historic Accuracy ,2.2 P4</p>		

Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan

APPENDIX 2

Comments Received from Pre-submission Consultation

Claverdon does not nor did not include Langley or Songar, The oldest historic site in the parish is the small Iron Age hill fort at Barnmoor, c 350-300BC. The village centred on the ridge was one of the Anglo -Saxon settlements cleared in the Forest of Arden & included in the Domesday Survey of 1086. In Saxon times Bovi , a free man held it & was dispossessed & the manor passed to Robert the Earl of Mellent who became the Earl of Leicester. He passed it on to his brother Henry the first Earl of Warwick. Claverdon was held from the Crown by the Earls of Warwick for most of the medieval period & until 1568. The population was centred near the church & field archaeology has revealed the evidence of medieval house platforms & pottery in the adjacent fields & on the site of the former park created by the Earls of Warwick. Small groups of houses are situated some distance from the main centre at Kington, Gannaway, Lye Green & Yarningale. The majority of listed buildings in the parish consist of timber-framed farmhouses & cottages dating from the 16th & 17th centuries. This mainly agricultural community remained largely unchanged until well into the 20th century

2.4 whilst not whilst: 2.5 housed not houses: 3.0 P6 defences not defences: 5.5 P14 Evans, is this Gannaway

App1 P32 construction not consultation: App2 P33 (pavilion) for not fro: App3 P38 (v green) tree 1 not trees. Green not common: App4 P39 pitches not paying grounds: App 5 P40 has not as (a church): A priest is recorded at Claverdon in 1086, the list of vicars goes back to 1208. The oldest part of the present building is the chancel arch c1350, the tower is c 1450

COMMENTS

Policy NE 1 - Valued Landscapes

6.16 P24 Barnmoor Green & Parish owned woodland at Kington Rise have been omitted. Why is this? They need to be included in App 3

Policy BE 2 Designated Heritage Assets

7.4 P27 how do you explain the permission given for the extensions & alterations at Fobello, Station Rd which appear to contradict this criterion, resulting in a building that looks more suitable for an industrial estate & is now completely out of character with its neighbours. See App1P32

Policy CSL 2 - Sports and Leisure Activities

8.13 P30 the installation of floodlighting at the tennis courts is opposed by many

The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group took guidance from the Local Authority who agreed the removal of Langley, but not Songar.

Noted

Amendments made

Details added.

Considered but not added

Comment noted

Noted

Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan

APPENDIX 2

Comments Received from Pre-submission Consultation

residents.

Conclusion

The Neighbourhood Plan 2011-2031 represents a great deal of work by those people involved in its preparation, it will be interesting to see the control it exerts over the future development & protection of this community.

Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan

APPENDIX 2

Comments Received from Pre-submission Consultation

John Ward	Resident - Church Road, CV35 8PB	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
9	<p>Response</p> <p>Overall we appreciate the effort of those that drafted the plan, particularly volunteers. We think it important for people to respond as otherwise the plan has limited value and legitimacy, undermining the effort put into it. Most of it seems sound and well-thought-through.</p> <p>In our view, it would be a better plan if more specific local measures were proposed (with useful detail) and less carry-over/copying from other documents that add nothing (eg from SDC core strategy, VDS).</p> <p>Personally I would like to see measures to keep the school sustainable/attractive; for measures to plant more trees in the village/public land; for investment into the footpaths and land access, FTTP and floodlights for the tennis courts (or a whizzy new sports centre). We shouldn't bumble along and allow the village to gently decline.</p> <p>There is no section on funding or funding strategy, for example access to CIL money, budget allocations at SDC/WCC for community assets (eg all the libraries/swimming pools are in towns) – or how we as villagers might pay for them. If we don't sort funding, most of the aspirations will still be aspirations at the end of the plan period.</p> <p>There are many minor comments possible, but we restrict our written response to material points:</p> <p>3.0 A Future Vision for Claverdon</p> <p>This is “fluffy” and therefore has limited value in that it could mean all things to all people. It could apply to any community.</p> <p>It would seem far more relevant and valuable to make it more personal to Claverdon - for example to make clear statements of our current ambition such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) “We want to keep Claverdon’s designation as an LSV3” b) “We want to maintain both the DM Hall and the Church Centre as community facilities” c) “We want to expand the school” (eg on-site nursery, sports facilities, other) d) “We want to build a multi-sports hall [on the Boys Club/school land]” 	<p>Comments were considered, and the details noted</p>

Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan

APPENDIX 2

Comments Received from Pre-submission Consultation

This would make a referendum on the plan arguably worth the expense, whereas voting on fluff seems pointless.

The list of bullets on page 5 appears vague/random and lacks specificity, realistic assessment or prioritisation. Without a clear target, identified resource and budget, such statements limit the value of the Plan and may bring it into disrepute. The 2012 Parish Plan seems better in this regard, though even this could be improve on. Either create clear targets/plans, or drop them.

In terms of the list, mobile telecoms is mentioned. However FTTP is not. Yet Fibre is probably far more significant to the village in the long term, as broadband can resolve mobile coverage and provide wider/deeper future services. We have FTTC in the village and cabling up to residents homes is an obvious investment that the Neighbourhood Plan could address.

Policy H3 (c)

We object to the criteria of “enhancement in the character and appearance”. This is because it appears regular practice that landowners are deliberately leaving their property in a poor state for years in order to enhance its chances to be redeveloped (as H3 proposes). This is a perverse incentive and should be removed. Preferably H3 is written to work the other way, that where a site has been well looked after, it may be re-used (and vice versa). This would encourage everyone to be a good landowner.

Policy H4

We don't understand why this is limited to within the Village Boundary. Surely these objectives should apply across the Parish? If the answer is that land outside the boundary is covered by general planning law, then this is the case within the Village Boundary too, in which case H4 can be deleted.

Policy E1 c) and d)

These seem too broad and open to abuse. These exemptions should be removed, or the tests should be tightened (eg that no other environmental solution is available).

MEETING DID NOT AGREE

List of Businesses (page 14)

This seems incomplete and one doesn't appear an employer (CLT). What is the purpose of including a list that is wrong/incomplete or will get out of date?

Noted – no amendments made

Noted – no amendments made

Noted – no amendments made

Noted & amendments made

Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan

APPENDIX 2

Comments Received from Pre-submission Consultation

Policy E4

This is a clear “miss”. The infrastructure is already covered by Building Regs part R rendering E4 unnecessary duplication of regulation. It would be more relevant for this policy or H5 to draft measures to enable FTTP connections within the village.

Policy BE1 / Appendix 1

We don't know the status of Appendix 1.

BE1 is clear in pointing the reader to the Village Design Statement. Adding Appendix 1 to the Neighbourhood plan confuses matters, in that the VDS is the definitive document. We therefore recommend that Appendix 1 is deleted as it appears an example of poor regulation, creating confusion and potentially conflicting requirements. Referencing the VDS is sufficient. Otherwise you need to state which document takes precedence etc

Cooperation Mechanisms

The Neighbourhood Plan or CPC could usefully provide a lead on this area, on which the plan is silent. Infrastructure, or other community schemes, will be far more investable, cheaper and/or quicker, where the community was mobilised to act together. (For example, we all agree to switch to the first mobile network that provides a strong enough signal). This is difficult, but it would make Claverdon a better serviced community.

The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group considered this and took advice. E4 remains.

After consideration Appendix 1 was removed and replaced with the Village Design Statement to avoid any Confusion

The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group considered that this was for the Community to decide and could not be determined by the Neighbourhood Plan

Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan

APPENDIX 2

Comments Received from Pre-submission Consultation

	W. Hawkswood	Owner - Land off Breach Lane behind Houses on Langley Rd.	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
10	<p>Response</p> <p>Policies NE 1 and NE 4</p> <p>I write on behalf of Mr W Hawkeswood, the owner of land off Breach Lane, Claverdon, as shown on the attached aerial image.</p> <p>I note that the Pre-Submission Consultation Neighbourhood Plan (PSCNP) proposes that the land be subject to Policy NE4 Designating Local Greenspaces (site 6) and also to Policy NE1 Valued Landscapes (inc important skylines and views). It is of course understandable that PSCNP wishes to acknowledge the openness of the site and the amenity it currently provides but it should also recognise that the land has the potential to provide new housing in the village and is well placed to do so in line with PSCNP Policy H2 Meeting Local Housing Needs as it lies immediately adjacent to the Village Boundary.</p> <p>Therefore my client's site, together with those nearby, should be reviewed as part of the Neighbourhood Plan's necessary engagement with interested landowners to ensure the best use is made of the land available in the village to provide new housing in a way that retains important landscape features and views & physical links into & from the site whilst at the same time providing improved recreation and community facilities, notably the provision of much needed additional car parking for the school. However Policies NE1 and NE4 as included in PSCNP would unnecessarily, inappropriately and inflexibly constrain such an exercise. This is unfortunate as there is a real opportunity here to use the Neighbourhood Plan process in a positive way to develop proposals that meet a wide spectrum of needs in the village.</p> <p>My client & I would be happy to facilitate discussion of options for such development with all interested parties including of course the Parish Council. However I note from the statutory Notice in respect of the Pre-Submission Consultation that "Representations will not be acknowledged or have individual responses" and so if the Parish Council feels that it cannot participate in such discussions, then I would be grateful if it could register these representations as objections to Policies NE1 and NE4 insofar as they apply to land off Breach Lane on the basis set out above in order to protect my client's position in the Neighbourhood Plan process.</p> <p>Nonetheless, I should stress that my client would wish to work with the Parish Council and</p>		<p>CLAV 6 - Angar Wood and adjacent fields, has been removed from the Neighbourhood Plan following the assessment of this site as an LGS by the Local Authority.</p> <p>The comments were considered and it should be noted that the Neighbourhood Plan Survey Topline Results show that 96% of the survey respondents wanted the green spaces protected, & 96% of respondents wanted the footpaths and walks protected.</p>

Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan

APPENDIX 2

Comments Received from Pre-submission Consultation

	others in a collaborative way to take matters forward.	
	Ian Lings	Woodland Trust
		Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
11	<p>Response NE 1 NE 4 NE 5</p> <p>Thank you very much for consulting the Woodland Trust on your neighbourhood plan for Claverdon, we very much appreciate the opportunity. Neighbourhood planning is an important mechanism for also embedding trees into local communities, as such we are very supportive of some of the policies set out in your plan.</p> <p><u>A Future Vision for Claverdon</u></p> <p>The Woodland Trust is pleased to see that your vision for Claverdon identifies the importance of its quality landscape, and how it is enriched by its open aspect to the countryside, whilst also seeking to avoid harm to important landscape views and maintaining and enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity.</p> <p>Trees are some of the most important features of the area for local people. This is being acknowledged with the adopted Stratford –on-Avon District Core Strategy 2011- 2031, which resists development resulting in the loss of woodland, hedgerows and trees. One of the objectives of Policy CS.5 (Landscape) is to protect, manage and plan for the preservation of valued landscapes, such as trees and hedgerows and woodlands. This general Local Plan policy should also be taken into account with the vision and objectives in the Neighbourhood Plan for Claverdon.</p> <p>Therefore, the vision of your Neighbourhood Plan should be amended to also seek to protect and enhance the local landscape character of Claverdon and include the following:</p> <p>“To protect and enhance the local environment, green and open spaces, ancient woodland, veteran trees hedgerows and trees”.</p>	

Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan

APPENDIX 2

Comments Received from Pre-submission Consultation

Included in the Neighbourhood Plan at para 3.5

Land use policies

We are pleased to see that the Neighbourhood Plan for Claverdon does identify the need to conserve and enhance its landscape, and how any new development in your Parish needs to respect its distinctive landscape character. However, your Plan for Claverdon should also seek to ensure development must conserve mature trees and hedgerows, so there is no loss or degradation of ancient woodland in your parish. It should also support conserving and enhancing woodland and trees, such as Pine Oak and Lime trees, with management, and also to plant more trees in appropriate locations. Increasing the amount of trees and woods in Claverdon will provide enhanced green infrastructure for your local communities, and also mitigate against the future loss of trees to disease (eg Ash dieback), with a new generation of trees both in woods and also outside woods in streets, hedgerows and amenity sites.

Information can be found here: <http://www.magic.gov.uk/MagicMap.asp> and <http://www.ancient-tree-hunt.org.uk/discoveries/interactivemap/>

Ancient woodland would benefit from strengthened protection building on the National Planning Policy Forum (NPPF). On 5th March 2018 the Prime Minister Theresa May launched the draft revised NPPF for consultation. Paragraph 173 c states:

development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable mitigation strategy exists. Where development would involve the loss of individual aged or veteran trees that lie outside ancient woodland, it should be refused unless the need for, and benefits of, development in that location would clearly outweigh the loss;

Whilst recognising that this policy is draft we believe it must be given due weight in the plan making process as it shows a clear direction of travel from central Government to strengthen the protection of irreplaceable ancient woodland.

Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan

APPENDIX 2

Comments Received from Pre-submission Consultation

Therefore, we would recommend that your all of the land use policies of your Neighbourhood Plan should include something along these lines: ***“Substantial harm to or loss of irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodland, should be wholly exceptional”***.

Noted. No amendment made

The Woodland Trust would suggest that your Neighbourhood Plan is more specific about ancient woodland protection. For example, the introduction and background to the consultation on the Kimbolton Neighbourhood Development Plan (2017) identified the importance of ancient woodland, and how it should be protected and enhanced. Also, we would like to see buffering distances set out. For example, for most types of development (i.e. residential), a planted buffer strip of 50m would be preferred to protect the core of the woodland in the geographical area of your Neighbourhood Plan. Standing Advice from Natural England and the Forestry Commission has some useful information:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-and-veteran-trees-protection-surveys-licences>

The profile of Claverdon identifies the need to retain and enhance its rural character as a small rural settlement, and also the need for development to integrate with the landscape. Given that Neighbourhood Plans are a great opportunity to think about how trees can also enhance your community and the lives of its residents, the natural environment and tree and woodland conservation in Claverdon, should also be taken into account with a Policy in your Plan.

Therefore, we would like to see the importance of trees and woodland recognised for providing healthy living and recreation also being taken into account with your Neighbourhood Plan for Claverdon. In an era of ever increasing concern about the nation’s physical and mental health, the Woodland Trust strongly believes that trees and woodland can play a key role in delivering improved health & wellbeing at a local level. Whilst, at the same time, the Health & Social Care Act 2012 has passed much of the responsibility for health & wellbeing to upper-tier and unitary local authorities, and this is reinforced by the Care Act 2014. Also, each new house being built in your parish should

Noted

The Neighbourhood Plan has been amended to

Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan

APPENDIX 2

Comments Received from Pre-submission Consultation

require a new street tree, and also car parks must have trees within them.

Implementation

Whilst your key funding for proposed projects puts forward a variety of priorities in your Neighbourhood Plan, such as the principal importance of landscaping, it should also seek to protect ancient hedgerows and deciduous woodlands, as well as also seeking to retain and enhance open green spaces and resist the loss of open space. Whilst also ensuring the provision of some more, to what extent there is considered to be enough accessible open space in your community also needs to be taken into account. There are Natural England and Forestry Commission standards which can be used with developers on this:

The Woodland Access Standard aspires:

- That no person should live more than 500m from at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 2ha in size.
- That there should also be at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 20ha within 4km (8km round trip) of people's homes.

The Woodland Trust also believes that trees and woodlands can deliver a major contribution to resolving a range of water management issues, particularly those resulting from climate change, like flooding and the water quality implications caused by extreme weather events. This is important in the area covered by your Neighbourhood Plan because trees offer opportunities to make positive water use change, whilst also contributing to other objectives, such as biodiversity, timber & green infrastructure - see the Woodland Trust publication ***Stemming the flow*** – the role of trees and woods in flood protection - <https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/publications/2014/05/stemming-the-flow/>.

Woodland Trust Publications

/We would like to take this opportunity to draw your attention to the Woodland Trust's

neighbourhood planning microsite:

<https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/campaigning/neighbourhood-planning/> which may give you

“All new developments require a new tree for each house built.”

Noted

Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan

APPENDIX 2

Comments Received from Pre-submission Consultation

further ideas for your plan and monitoring progress.

/Also, the Woodland Trust have recently released a planners manual which is a multi-purpose document and is intended for policy planners, such as community groups preparing Neighbourhood Plans. Our guide can be found at:

<https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/mediafile/100820409/planning-for-ancient-woodland-planners-manual-for-ancient-woodland-and-veterandtrees.pdf?cb=8298cbf2eaa34c7da329eee3bd8d48ff>

In addition other Woodland Trust research which may assist with taking your Neighbourhood Plan foreword is a policy and practice section on our website, which provides lots of more specific evidence on more specific issues such as air quality, pollution and tree disease:

<https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/publications/>

Our evidence base is always expanding through vigorous programme of PhDs and partnership working. So please do check back or get in touch if you have a specific query. You may also be interested in our free community tree packs, schools and community groups can claim up to 420 free trees every planting season: <http://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/plant-trees/community-tree-pack/>

If I can be of any assistance please do not hesitate to get in touch, I would be more than happy to discuss this further with you. If you require any further information or would like to discuss specific issues please do not hesitate to contact Victoria Bankes Price – Planning Advisor 0343 7705767 victoriabankesprice@woodlandtrust.org.uk

Best wishes and good luck with your plan

Ian Lings – Local Planning Support Volunteer
On behalf of the Woodland Trust

The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group valued the supportive response made by the Woodland Trust and included some of the recommendations as shown above.8

12	Jasbir Kaur	WCC Planning and Development Group	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
----	-------------	------------------------------------	--

Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan

APPENDIX 2

Comments Received from Pre-submission Consultation

Response

WCC cannot commit to financial implications from proposals emanating from Neighbourhood Plans, but will assist in delivering infrastructure providing funding is coming from Section 106 programmes.

Supports the emphasis placed on improving footpaths and cycle routes.

Policy NE 2 - Flooding and Drainage

Page 3 – 4 It might be worth including a few sentences on the geography of the parish, making reference to the watercourse that runs underneath Station Rd/A4189. You could include that the area is at risk from surface water flooding, as well as river flooding. It might be worth checking the parishes flood risk online at <https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map>

Noted

Page 11 re Policy H3 :-

You could add to your criteria a specific point or explanation in reference to drainage discharge rates and SUDS when developing on brownfield sites.

Noted

The LLFA (Lead Local Flood Authority) requires the use of above ground SUDS designed in accordance with CIRIA 753 SUDS manual, providing attenuation to greenfield runoff rates (inclusive of developing on brownfield land), and include that 5 l/s is NOT the minimum possible discharge rate achievable.

The requirements set out in the following documents should also be adhered to in all cases:

- The National Planning Policy Framework
- Paragraphs 030 - 032 of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
- Defra's Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems

Page 23 re Policy NE2:-

It is good to see a well-established policy in relation to flooding and drainage; a few points to consider including:

- Further details on what type of SUDS features the community would prefer and find most beneficial. We would suggest mentioning the multiple benefits of SUDS, including greater biodiversity, amenity value and improved water quality, with a strong preference to above ground SUDS.

The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group took advice and the only amendment recommended was to remove the reference to "fluvial" flooding.

Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan

APPENDIX 2

Comments Received from Pre-submission Consultation

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Referring to the SUDS discharge hierarchy would be of benefit, with the preferred choice of infiltration or water discharged into an existing watercourse being the first options, before connecting to a sewer. - Any new developments should be designed and built with separate systems up to the point of where they connect to the combined sewer, in line with building regulations. - You could include a point that encourages new developments to open up any existing culverts on a site providing more open space/green infrastructure, and the creation of new culverts should be kept to a minimum. 		<p>The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group received specific advice that the NPPF does not support this approach.</p>
	Alistair Hinch	WCC Planning and Development Group	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
13	<p>Policy H 2 I would prefer to see a statement that maintains the village boundary rather than expanding it.</p> <p>Policy E 5 I would like to register that I would rather maintain the current level of mobile coverage than see a new mast appear somewhere on the edge of the village.</p> <p>Policy NE 4 Very supportive the views expressed in the section on valued landscapes and section NE4 on designed local green spaces.</p> <p>On the connection of mains gas, I would suggest that the due to the cost and disruption caused, subsidising renewable sources of heating would be a better use of capital.</p>		<p>Noted, however the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group decided no amendment was required.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. After consideration the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group removed the restriction of mains gas to the built area of Claverdon village. No other change was made as consideration was given to what might be possible within the next 20 years</p>
	Kate Gover	Claverdon School	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
14	<p>History Corrections Suggested: Within A History of Claverdon on Page 4. Under Transport Paragraph 2.3 - Rail services are provided by West Midlands Railway (no</p>		

Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan

APPENDIX 2

Comments Received from Pre-submission Consultation

correct)

Under Education Paragraph 2.6 - Paragraph should read "Claverdon Primary School is located in Breach Lane in the village of Claverdon. **It is a Community School within the Warwickshire Local Authority area and has 198 Students in seven discrete year groups.** The School's House system uses names taken from surrounding areas (Kington, Gannaway and Yarningale."

The Neighbourhood Plan was amended to reflect the comment in bold

Page 24, Policy NE 4 - 'Boys Club Field' should be called 'Ambition Field'

The Neighbourhood Plan was amended

Page 29 Paragraph 8.8 make to read - 'The School is in good condition and has the opportunity within its walls and land to further develop to provide further facilities. Currently, no funding is available for development, but this would provide an income stream for the school through usage of the facility out of school hours and, of course allowing a growth of pupil numbers.

The Neighbourhood Plan was amended

Page 33 - Appendix 2 - Community Aspirations.

4th Paragraph revised to read "The old Boys Club Field, located to the rear of the school is now owned by 'Ambition' - an umbrella charity incorporating Boys Clubs and is sometimes used as an overflow for the main recreation field, but due to its lack of facilities/car parking etc. cannot be considered as a suitable replacement. Confirmed Public access at the discretion of Ambition who are responsible for Public Liability Insurance."

The Neighbourhood Plan was amended

Paragraph 4 to be revised to read ' The Old Boys Club Field located to the rear of the school is now owned by Ambition (an umbrella charity incorporating boys clubs) is sometimes used as an overflow for the main recreation field, but due to its lack of facilities/car parking etc. cannot be considered as a suitable replacement. Continued public access is only at the discretion of Ambition, who are responsible for the Public Liability Insurance.

The Neighbourhood Plan has been changed to reflect these details

Paragraph 10, commencing 'The School value each individual.....' should read 'The School values each individual'.

Amended

Page 34 - Paragraph commencing **The School Hall** to be reduced and corrected to read in full "**The School Hall** is desperately in need of replacement or repair but there is no funding

Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan

APPENDIX 2

Comments Received from Pre-submission Consultation

	The Coal Authority		Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
17	No Specific Comments		-Noted
	Mr. and Mrs. Mayall CV35 8PJ	Area CLAV 8 - Open Spaces	Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response
18	<p>We refer to the Pre-Submission Consultation version of the Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan 2011-2031 and to a letter dated January 2018 from the Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group headed, Claverdon Neighbourhood Development Plan. We note that the plan and process are referred to both as a Neighbourhood Plan and a Neighbourhood Development Plan but assume that use of both titles refer to the same document and process. The letter invites comment addressed to the Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group directly or via the formal consultation process although the letter from the Parish Clerk indicates that the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group is responsible for the formal consultation. We further understand that following formal consultation the Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group may amend the Pre-Submission Consultation prior to presentation to the District Council in its amended form. We request being advised when the final version of the Claverdon Neighbourhood Development Plan is approved by the Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group and the timetable for submission to the District Council. We also request a copy of the finalised plan as approved by the Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group.</p> <p>We refer specifically to paragraph 6 of the Pre-Submission Consultation Policy NE4 - Designated Local Green Space on page 24 to 26 and to the site reference CLAV8 (Fields located off Langley Road, south of Claverdon) on page 44 at Appendix 3.</p> <p>For the reasons set out below we wish to put on record our objection to inclusion of part of our land as described in CLAV8 as an area of Designated Local Green Space.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The land already enjoys protection from adverse development as a result of its existing designation as Green Belt. 		<p>The letter was considered and the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group recommended that the area CLAV 8 be removed from the Open Spaces Designation. Mr. and Mrs. Mayall have been advised of this.</p>

Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan

APPENDIX 2

Comments Received from Pre-submission Consultation

- o The primary function of the land is agricultural, its use as agricultural land has created the environment which is currently enjoyed and valued. The land is not a “formal sports or recreational space or an informal area of play and open space” which are the categories defined under Policy NE4 said to be attributed to the designated areas for local green space. The need to safeguard the land from inappropriate development is adequately ensured by the existing Green Belt designation.
- o Paragraph 6.17 requires that local communities are encouraged to include “robustly justified” Local Green spaces within their neighbourhood plans. We submit that there is no justification for inclusion of this land which already enjoys statutory protection.
- o We also submit that inclusion of this land is bizarre when other land closer to the village is not proposed for inclusion.
- o The specific qualities of the land referenced at Appendix 3 refer to the use of the fields by walkers and for sledging by local children. The plan must recognise that “the fields” are used for agriculture and specifically for sheep grazing. There is no public access other than by the footpath which runs north/south along the eastern boundary of the area defined by CLAV8. Dog walkers on the footpath are not always very good at keeping dogs under control with the potential consequence of injury to livestock. Any access to the land other than by the footpath cannot be permitted. It is unfortunate that even public access limited to the footpath and sometimes beyond by trespass results in littering and destruction of the very environment which has arisen as a result of the land being used for farming.
There is no public access permitted to the fields for sledging or any other recreation. However, there seems to be a perception that sledging is a ‘given’ activity. We have never been asked for permission and none has been given. But in the spirit of community we have never challenged the sledgers. We are challenging this being formalised now, however.
- o The fields are used for grazing livestock. Littering, worrying by dogs and damage to field boundaries are consequences of unregulated access.

Claverdon Neighbourhood Plan

APPENDIX 2

Comments Received from Pre-submission Consultation

20	<p>hall) 2.Our post code is cv358pd not cv358pb 3.The Preschool on site is called Stepping Stones Preschool not Church Centre Nursery - and their post code needs correcting as well. (They are not in any way affiliated to the Church or the School and run as a completely separate business in their own right) 4.The Claverdon Church Centre does not appear as an employer on the your list - but Geoff Gee, the caretaker, and myself work here (I am employed by the PCC and Geoff is self-employed) 5.In your bar chart showing number of people who use each amenity in the village. Claverdon Church Centre (again referred to as the church hall) is listed at 28% and should therefore appear as the 3rd highest used amenity above the recreation ground which is listed at 27%. It currently sits below it for some reason.</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan was amended The Neighbourhood Plan was amended Noted The Neighbourhood Plan was amended Noted</p>
	<p>Sundry Non-Relevant</p>	<p>Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Response</p>
	<p>Sundry initial (often auto) responses were received acknowledging receipt of the notification saying things like “we will be responding in our normal time scale” but then never did. These include: - WCC Traffic Management : JRC Windfarm Co-ordinations : National Grid : Ramblers : Cotswold Conservation Board. The Coal Authority and Natural England responded saying that they had no specific comments to make on the plan.</p>	<p>No Input required</p>