

Claverdon Neighbourhood Development Plan
Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation
(Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations, 2012)
Appendix 1 - Comments from Stratford-on-Avon District Council

Section	Reference/page	Comment
List of Contents	List of Appendices, p.2	Appendix 3 is on page 36, not page 35 as indicated in draft NDP.
1.0 Introduction	The Rationale, p.3 Para 1.2	Insert capital 'D' for 'district' on 2nd line.
2.0 A History of Claverdon	p.4, General	A number of paragraphs have text underlined (and are blue in colour). It is not clear why this is...they are not 'links' to other text and it looks at odds with the rest of the text. Additionally, a number of sections on this page appear to be different font styles, with some 'bolder' than others. These issues need amending to fit with the rest of the text.
2.0 A History of Claverdon	Intro – p.4, para 2.1	Insert capital 'C' for 'civil' and capital 'P' for 'parish'; insert '-on-Avon' after 'Stratford'; capital 'D' for 'district'. Amend the second sentence to read: "The village is located in the north west part of the District and...".
2.0 A History of Claverdon	Intro – p.4, para 2.2	Begin "The name 'Claverdon' comes from...". Second sentence – Langley is not a town and in any case is outside the Parish/Neighbourhood area and as such needs to be removed from the text. Suggest second sentence should read: "...which includes the former Manors of Claverdon, Kington and Songar...". Third sentence – remove "...and there is also a group of houses near the school" as it does not appear to fit with context of the 'scene setting' and is unnecessary. Begin fourth sentence "Claverdon has modern..."; insert 'such as' between 'buildings' and 'the forge'.
2.0 A History of Claverdon	Transport – p.4, para 2.3	Replace 'on' with 'upon' on 2nd line. Remove "...with flights to Europe, Asia and America" as it is unnecessary.
2.0 A History of Claverdon	Local Economy – p.4, para 2.4	Insert 'neighbourhood' between 'the' and 'area' and insert 'with' between 'area' and 'most' on the 1st line; Begin second sentence "Examples include:"
2.0 A History of Claverdon	Local Economy – p.4, para 2.5	Re-word first sentence: "The village shop closed in 2007 and whilst the butcher's shop, which also housed the Post Office, broadened its range of goods for sale it could not be sustained and closed in 2014." Question: does this mean the Post Office closed as well? It's not clear...; Re-word second and third sentences: "Eventually, a community shop was created to replace the village shop. It began in a steel hut next to the Dorothea Mitchell Hall but is now housed in a permanent structure that was constructed in the same location".

Section	Reference/page	Comment
2.0 A History of Claverdon	Education – p.4, para 2.6	Replace 'in' with 'within' and delete 'of Claverdon' in the 1st line.
3.0 A Future Vision for Claverdon	p.5 – para 3.3	Replace 'return' with 'returning the questionnaire'; replace 'Neighbourhood Plan Group' with 'Parish Council' or 'Qualifying Body'; Re-word final sentence: "Utilising the District Council for this task ensured independence and guaranteed all responses would remain confidential".
3.0 A Future Vision for Claverdon	p.5 – para 3.4	Add 'Neighbourhood Plan' between 'from' and 'Steering'; add 'could be' between 'or' and 'printed'; The penultimate sentence refers to 'quoted percentages', where are these in the NDP?
3.0 A Future Vision for Claverdon	p.5 – para 3.5	Replace 'As residents and with our Parish Council, we will all' with 'The community will'; third bullet point – add 's' to 'requirement'; seventh bullet point – add 'Supporting the...'; eighth bullet point – add 'Supporting a...' and replace 'aging' with 'ageing'; ninth bullet point – add 'Promoting a...'; tenth bullet point – add 'Encouraging an...'; eleventh bullet point – add 'Promoting improved...'; twelfth bullet point – add 'Supporting the...'; thirteenth bullet point – add 'Supporting the...'. .
3.0 A Future Vision for Claverdon	Strategic Objectives, p.6 - General	It is unclear from the NDP how the strategic objectives have been identified – this needs remedying. It would also be helpful to commence each of the following sections by re-stating the appropriate strategic objective.
3.0 A Future Vision for Claverdon	Strategic Objectives: Housing, p.6	This objective should acknowledge that new homes should meet the needs of new residents, not just existing ones (as set out in bullet point 8 of para 3.5 on p.5).
3.0 A Future Vision for Claverdon	Strategic Objectives: Economy and Infrastructure, p.6	The objective seeks (amongst other things) 'on-going improvements to flood defences'. However, it does not state where, or why. There are no rivers or watercourses running through, or close to the village of Claverdon. As such, the requirement for flood defences requires clarification and justification.
4.0 Housing	Strategic Objective, p.7	The text below the heading 'Strategic Objective' is not the objective, but details to provide the reader with background information on recent housing commitments. This could be slightly confusing and it would be appropriate to re-state the strategic objective below this heading in a shaded box.
4.0 Housing	p.7, para 4.2	Reduce '28' to '25' when confirming housing commitments. This is due to the 2007 and 2009 permissions relating to replacement dwellings (with no net gain they should not be counted) and the 2014 permission at Hercules Farm relating to the conversion of the existing farmhouse to two dwellings, with a net gain of only one property, not two as stated.
4.0 Housing	p.7, para 4.2 (Table of Housing Commitments)	General comment: It would be very useful to include a column to include the details of the planning permissions. This would help confirm errors (as set out above) or potential duplicates when the same address appears more than once.
4.0 Housing	p.7, para 4.2 (Table of Housing Commitments)	Remove entry for 07/02938/FUL; remove entry for 09/01590/FUL; reduce entry for 14/01551/FUL to 1 market home; amend sub-total from 25 to 22 and amend total number of dwellings from 28 to 25.

Section	Reference/page	Comment
4.0 Housing	p.7, para 4.3	The associated bullet points do not quote Policy CS.10 or the NPPF accurately. With something as critical as Green Belt policy, the NDP should reflect assessment criteria accurately to avoid misinterpretation or miss-use.
4.0 Housing	p.8, para 4.7	Insert capital 'D' for 'district' in 1st line; add '...in accordance with para 89 of the NPPF' after 'need' at the end of the first sentence.
4.0 Housing	Policy H1, p.8	Consider adding "...subject to compliance with other policies in this Plan" to the end of the first paragraph on the policy; The Green Belt washes over the built-up area of Claverdon as well as the surrounding countryside. The policy should state this as per para 4.9 of the explanatory text.
4.0 Housing	p.8, para 4.9	Insert capital 'D' for 'district'.
4.0 Housing	p.8, para 4.10	This paragraph does not mention 'local need' housing within/on the periphery of the village of Claverdon or refer to the conversion and re-development of existing buildings. It is considered these matters require incorporation.
4.0 Housing	p.8, para 4.12	The District Council does not agree with the PC's methodology of not following existing site boundaries (such as large gardens) to produce the settlement boundary for Claverdon. The matter of segmenting residential land in this way has been considered in two recent neighbourhood plan Examinations in this District (i.e. Snitterfield and Stratford-upon-Avon). In both instances, the Examiner agreed with the District Council that sites on the edges of villages should not be artificially divided and in both cases, the Examiner concluded that the entire curtilage should be included in each instance. It should be noted that Snitterfield is a 'Green Belt village' just like Claverdon. For consistency, this paragraph needs to be re-written to take account of this stance and the associated Figure 2 should also be amended.
4.0 Housing	p.9 – Figure 2	<p>The Conservation Area boundaries do not show up very well. Consideration should be given to create a further map and have Figure 2 just showing the proposed village boundary and new Figure 'x' showing heritage assets (i.e. Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas), for clarity.</p> <p>As noted above, there are a number of inconsistencies in the village boundary when considered against SDC's criteria for assessing built-up area boundaries for villages. These are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school playing field has been included within the boundary • Paddock/scrubland to the south of the school playing field has been included • The residential garden associated with the property 'Beechwood Ridge' has been excluded • The car park and hardstanding associated with The Red Lion Public House has been excluded • Non-residential land to the rear of the properties 'Elm Cottage' and 'Meadow Cottage' has been included • The residential property known as 'Swallows Nest' and its entire curtilage has been excluded <p>Based on recent Examinations and for consistency of approach, the above should be rectified.</p>

Section	Reference/page	Comment
4.0 Housing	Policy H2, p.10	Replace 'permitted' with 'supported' in the first paragraph – for consistency of approach throughout the Plan in terms of terminology.
4.0 Housing	p.10, para 4.15	Should 'alternative' read 'affordable' when talking of the need for housing?
4.0 Housing	Policy H3, p.11	Amend criterion b) to read: "Any contaminants are satisfactorily dealt with by remedial works previously agreed by the Local Planning Authority;" to clarify that it is the contaminants that require removal; Begin criterion d) "The use would..." in order for it to read correctly from the first paragraph of the policy.
4.0 Housing	Policy H4, p.11	Replace 'permitted' with 'supported' in the first paragraph – for consistency of approach throughout the Plan in terms of terminology; add 'will:' at the end of the first paragraph and delete 'Do' from the start of criterion b) in order for it to read correctly from the first paragraph of the policy.
4.0 Housing	p.12, para 4.20	The paragraph talks about 'inappropriate development' within gardens but does not acknowledge that development can take place within the curtilage of a dwelling under permitted development rights. Also, whilst the terminology 'inappropriate development' is used in conjunction with Green Belt assessment, it is not clear whether this is the thrust of the explanatory text – would it be more appropriate to consider alternative wording within the policy?
5.0 Economy and Infrastructure	p.13, Strategic Objective	If the Strategic Objective listed at p.6 is re-iterated at the beginning of this section, para 5.1 will need to be re-phrased or deleted, since it would be repetitive.
5.0 Economy and Infrastructure	p.13, para 5.1	If the paragraph remains within the Plan, replace 'through support to' with 'by supporting' to improve how sentence reads. The paragraph refers to the provision of suitable premises for a number of businesses, including the 'mobile post office'. Is this an aspiration to provide it with permanent premises within the village? This should be explained a little more, since if the post office is 'mobile' it suggests it is not of 'fixed abode' and as such would not be covered by land-use planning policies.
5.0 Economy and Infrastructure	p.13, para 5.2	Add a full stop between 'Belt' and 'The' on 1st line; insert a capital 'D' for 'district' on 2nd line.
5.0 Economy and Infrastructure	p.13, para 5.3	Replace 'Green Belt that are permitted' with 'the neighbourhood area'; replace comma between 'are' and 'mineral' with ':'; the following list of examples would be better written as bullet points. The final sentence referring to transport links should be removed since there are no subsequent policies relating to this issue.
5.0 Economy and Infrastructure	Policy E1, p.13	Replace 'permitted' with 'supported' in the first paragraph – for consistency of approach throughout the Plan in terms of terminology; Criterion e) covers a different issue to the other points covered by this policy and should be a separate paragraph at the end of the policy; criterion f) repeats the first part of criterion b); within criterion f), suggest the wording from "Planning applications for..." should also be a separate paragraph within the policy.

Section	Reference/page	Comment
5.0 Economy and Infrastructure	p.14, list of farmsteads	It would be helpful to map the seven sites listed. Additionally, it is an unusual way to list them with what appears to be the surname of the farmer(?) followed by the name of the farm(?) only. Would it not be more appropriate to provide the farm name and address, with a link to an associated map?
5.0 Economy and Infrastructure	Policy E2, p.15	It is not clear where this policy would apply, given that new employment buildings are not listed within paragraph 89 of the NPPF as 'appropriate' forms of development in the Green Belt.
5.0 Economy and Infrastructure	Policy E3, p.15	In first paragraph under 'Homeworking', suggest deleting 'where appropriate' to be consistent with Policy E4 and also add '...in accordance with Policy E4' at the end of the paragraph; In first paragraph under 'Live-Work Units', replace 'mixed use' with 'live-work'.
5.0 Economy and Infrastructure	p.17, para 5.11	Insert 'phone' between 'mobile' and 'coverage' in third line.
6.0 The Natural Environment	Section title, p.18	Insert 'The' before 'Natural Environment' to be consistent with contents page.
6.0 The Natural Environment	p.18, para 6.2	This paragraph refers to the Claverdon Village Design Statement (VDS), but it is unclear what status (if any) this has – this should be clarified. Additionally, it would be useful if the VDS was added as an appendix to the NDP since it is being referred to...this will ensure readers will not need to go looking for it elsewhere.
6.0 The Natural Environment	Policy NE1, p.18	<p>Whilst the policy itself refers to skylines and views, the policy title does not. The protection of skylines and views is a separate issue to the protection of land and in order to not conflate these issues, it is considered they should be separate policies.</p> <p>The first paragraph of the policy refers to 'historic landscape features', but does not explain what they are nor does it list them. Could they be listed and also mapped?</p> <p>The value of this policy is not clear, since the land in question is open countryside and is washed over by the Green Belt. As such, these large tracts of land will not be under pressure to be developed. If this policy is retained in any form, the way the associated landscapes have been labelled at Figure 3 is confusing. There are two views labelled 'A' that are in opposite directions. Similarly, there are three views labelled 'B', again in different directions. It is suggested each view should have its own unique reference/label and associated description to avoid confusion.</p>
6.0 The Natural Environment	p.18, para 6.4	This paragraph refers to a 'Landscape Assessment' but does not indicate what this document is, or if it is published. Does it refer to the details set out on pages 19 to 22 of the NDP? If so, this required clarification.
6.0 The Natural Environment	p.19, Figure 3	The title of the map states it relates to 'Valued Landscapes and Important Skylines and Views'. However, it only appears to show views. There is confusion over the labelling of the views, as set out above.

Section	Reference/page	Comment
6.0 The Natural Environment	Policy NE2, p.23	<p>Policy NE2 does not add additional value, but replicates the principles set out in Core Strategy Policy CS.4 'Water Environment and Flood Risk'. In its present form, the policy principles which require the demonstration of existing or future water supply and treatment, together with suitable and satisfactory drainage is considered to be onerous on development.</p> <p>It should be noted that under the Water Industry Act 1991, water companies have a statutory duty to provide water supplies and effective waste water treatment. In addition, a number of water cycle studies were undertaken by the Council to inform the Core Strategy. The URS Water Cycle Update (WCS) 2014 confirmed that there was an adequate water supply to accommodate the proposed level of growth. However, it was recommended that in order to promote more sustainable level of water use and prevent further deterioration of ecosystems, more stringent level of water efficiency measures were required in development. Therefore, Core Strategy Policy CS.4 requires water efficiency levels that go beyond the current Building Regulations.</p> <p>It is unclear what is meant by 'quantity' in the policy principle which states "proposals that would result in an unacceptable risk to the quality and or quantity of a water body....". Core Strategy Policy CS.4 D provides protection for the water quality in line with the Water Framework Directive and the Environment Agency's River Basin Management Plans.</p>
6.0 The Natural Environment	p.23, para 6.10	With some minor re-wording, this paragraph could be included within policy NE2 itself. This may be worth considering in any future draft of the Plan.
6.0 The Natural Environment	p.23, para 6.11 (footnote 7)	This refers to a WCS update as 'Halcrow' (March 2014). However, this document was produced by URS, not Halcrow.
6.0 The Natural Environment	p.23, para 6.12	Insert capital 'D' for 'district' on seventh line of text.
6.0 The Natural Environment	p.23, para's 6.13 and 6.14	With some minor re-wording, these paragraphs could also be included within policy NE2 itself. This may be worth considering in any future draft of the Plan.
6.0 The Natural Environment	Policy NE3, p.24	It is encouraging to see that the draft plan wishes to promote the use of renewable energy and is looking to become carbon neutral Parish. The reference in the policy to 'tangible benefit' is unclear. It would be preferable to refer to a 'positive local benefit'. It would be helpful to define what types of schemes the policy refers to. For example, a community led initiative for renewable and low carbon energy might want to be supported and/or domestic scale energy efficiency and/or energy production from renewable and low carbon sources. The plan states that 'Claverdon will continue to be a leading example of decarbonisation of village communities'. Further explanation of this statement would be beneficial to all reading the Plan.

Section	Reference/page	Comment
6.0 The Natural Environment	Policy NE4, p.24	<p>Proposed Local Green Space 'CLAV1' appears to be two entirely separate parcels of land. Should they not have separate reference numbers?; In the final paragraph on p.24 – replace 'permitted' with 'supported' for consistency of approach throughout the Plan in terms of terminology.</p> <p>Following an evaluation of the 10 proposed LGS designations against the criteria set out in paragraph 77 of the NPPF, the LPA are satisfied that sites CLAV2, CLAV3, CLAV4, CLAV5 and CLAV10 meet the criteria for LGS designation. However, concerns are raised over sites CLAV1, CLAV6, CLAV7, CLAV8 and CLAV9 being included in the Plan, due to them not meeting the strict assessment criteria as set out in para 77 of the NPPF. This decision is explained in more detail in comments relating to Appendix 3 – LGS Assessments later in this schedule.</p>
6.0 The Natural Environment	Figure 4, p.25	Remove sites LGS1 (both sites), LGS6, LGS7, LGS8 and LGS9 from the map if they are removed from policy NE4 (see above).
6.0 The Natural Environment	Figure 4 (enlarged), p.26	Remove sites LGS6 and LGS7 from the map if they are removed from policy NE4 (see above).
7.0 The Built Environment	Section Title, p.27	Insert 'The' before 'Built Environment' to be consistent with contents page.
7.0 The Built Environment	Policy BE1, p.27	<p>Concern is raised that the requirement for 'all' development proposals to take account of the VDS is too onerous and does not take into account development that can be carried out under permitted development rights. There is no criteria specifically relating to materials within the policy, but is referred to within the Explanatory text.</p> <p>The policy should refer to Appendix 1 – Village Design Principles. However, it is unclear how these design principles have been derived and what relationship they have with the VDS – this needs to be clarified in the text.</p>
7.0 The Built Environment	Policy BE2, p.28	It is considered that the first paragraph promotes a different test of 'harm' to that outlined in the NPPF. To ensure it complies with national policy, it is suggested 'harm to the' is inserted between 'the' and 'significance'; again in order to comply with terminology within the NPPF, it is suggested 'preserve' should be replaced with 'conserve' in the second paragraph; since there are two Conservation Areas in Claverdon, therefore add 's' to 'Area' on third line of second paragraph.
7.0 The Built Environment	p.28, para 7.5	Replace 'Our village' with 'Claverdon'; replace the comma between 'buildings' and '2' with 'and'; add full stop after 'Areas' and delete 'and Scheduled Monuments' (since there aren't any); replace 'buildings and structures' with 'heritage assets'.
7.0 The Built Environment	p.28, para 7.6	Replace 'page 10' with 'page 9'.

Section	Reference/page	Comment
8.0 Community, Sports and Leisure	Policy CSL1, p.29	Replace 'be resisted' with 'not be supported' in first paragraph for consistency of approach throughout the Plan in terms of terminology. The policy fails to consider the possibility of any new community facilities. Is this an oversight?
8.0 Community, Sports and Leisure	p.29, para 8.8	Replace 'walls and land to further develop' with 'site parameters to expand if necessary'.
8.0 Community, Sports and Leisure	p.29, para 8.9	Replace 'children' with 'children's' to make it plural.
Appendix 2 – Community Aspirations	p.33	It is unclear how these have been identified and what is expected – this should be clarified in some explanatory text.
Appendix 3 – Local Green Space	p.36 – p.46	<p>Assessment of LGS against para 77 of NPPF:</p> <p><u>General comment:</u> Whilst text within the individual assessments at Appendix 3 attempt to provide justification for designating sites as LGS, concern is raised that the assessments do not cover all aspects of para 77 of the NPPF satisfactorily. In fact, the assessments do not make mention of the NPPF at all. The issue of whether the area is 'local in character' and is not an 'extensive tract of land' has not been covered at all, which is critical in LGS analysis. Therefore, concern is raised that 'evidence' as drafted in Appendix 3 is not sufficient.</p> <p>The comments below are based on criteria set out within para 77 of the NPPF.</p> <p>CLAV1: Made up of 2 sites. Combined site area is 8Ha, not 16Ha as set out in NDP. In the opinion of officers, the sites are not in reasonably close proximity of the community, are not 'local' in character (combined they are approximately the same size of the entire village of Claverdon) and as such could be classified as an extensive tract of land. Whilst it could be argued that the land in question is demonstrably special to the community as a leisure destination, since LGS designation should only be used when <u>all</u> the assessment criteria in the NPPF are met, the conclusion is that based on the evidence submitted, these sites do not meet para 77 of NPPF and should be removed from the Plan.</p> <p>CLAV2: Site area is 0.2Ha, not 0.4Ha as set out in NDP. In the opinion of officers, whilst the site is not in reasonably close proximity to Claverdon itself, there are a number of properties adjacent to the Green to which it serves. The site could be classified as 'local' in character is not an extensive tract of land. It is a distinctive green space and as such could be deemed as demonstrably special to the community. As such, it is concluded that this site does meet para 77 of NPPF and should be retained within the Plan.</p> <p>CLAV3: Site area is 0.02Ha. In the opinion of officers, the site is in close proximity to the community,</p>

Section	Reference/page	Comment
		<p>since it lies at the centre of the village. The site is 'local' in character is not an extensive tract of land. It is a small, but distinctive green space and as such could be deemed as demonstrably special to the community. As such, it is concluded that based on the evidence submitted, this site does meet para 77 of NPPF and should be retained within the Plan.</p> <p>CLAV4: Site area is 1.5Ha. In the opinion of officers, the site is in close proximity to the community, since it lies at the centre of the village. The site is 'local' in character is not an extensive tract of land. It is an area used for community recreation and as such is demonstrably special to the community. As such, it is concluded that based on the evidence submitted, this site does meet para 77 of NPPF and should be retained within the Plan.</p> <p>CLAV5: Site area is 0.5Ha. In the opinion of officers, the site is in close proximity to the community, since it lies at the centre of the village. The site is 'local' in character is not an extensive tract of land. It is made up of church and common land, forming a distinctive open green area at the heart of the community and as such is demonstrably special to the community. As such, it is concluded that based on the evidence submitted, this site does meet para 77 of NPPF and should be retained within the Plan.</p> <p>CLAV6: Site area is 2.9Ha. In the opinion of officers, the site is in reasonably close proximity of the community but raise concern that the land might not be classified as 'local' in character and as such could be classified as an extensive tract of land. A public footpath runs along the northeast and northwest boundaries of the field but there is no 'general' public access to the site. Much of the justification for this site relates to the existence of 'Angar Wood' adjacent to the field. However, this land is in private ownership and could only be described as a copse, not a wood in terms of scale. The copse also sits beyond the land indicated on Figure 4 and as such is not even part of site CLAV6. The site itself is a field of no real distinction, beauty, historic significance or recreational value. As such, it could not be classified as demonstrably special to the community. Since LGS designation should only be used when all the assessment criteria in the NPPF are met, the conclusion is that based on the evidence submitted, this site does not meet para 77 of NPPF and should be removed from the Plan.</p> <p>CLAV7: Site area is 2.5Ha. In the opinion of officers, the site is in reasonably close proximity of the community but are concerned that the land might not be classified as 'local' in character and as such could be classified as an extensive tract of land. Public footpaths cross the field but there is no 'general' public access to the site. Justification for the inclusion of this field relates to the existence of footpaths for dog walking and rambling. However, this land is in private ownership and the LPA have received a letter from the landowner outlining a history of the land being 'abused' by people using the footpaths and asking for the detrimental effect such a designation would have on their land. The site itself is a field of no real distinction, beauty, historic significance or recreational value. As such, it could not be classified as demonstrably special to the community. Since LGS designation should only be used when</p>

Section	Reference/page	Comment
		<p>all the assessment criteria in the NPPF are met, the conclusion is that based on the evidence submitted together with the third party representation, this site does not meet para 77 of NPPF and should be removed from the Plan.</p> <p>CLAV8: Site area is 4.7Ha. However, approximately 1 Ha is located outside the Parish and should not be included since it is outside the designated neighbourhood area. In the opinion of officers, the site is not in reasonably close proximity of the community, the land could not be classified as 'local' in character and as such could be classified as an extensive tract of land. There is no public access to the field. A public footpath runs along the eastern edge of the field, only. As such, there is no 'general' public access to the site. Justification for the inclusion of this field relates to it being used year round by walkers, but this can't be the case given the lack of public access. Officers cannot understand the distinction between this field and other fields surrounding it and why this one has been chosen for designation, in particular. The site itself is a field of no real distinction, beauty, historic significance or recreational value. As such, it could not be classified as demonstrably special to the community. Since LGS designation should only be used when all the assessment criteria in the NPPF are met, the conclusion is that based on the evidence submitted, this site does not meet para 77 of NPPF and should be removed from the Plan.</p> <p>CLAV9: Site area is 6.5Ha, not 7.9Ha as set out in the NDP. The site is privately owned woodland. In the opinion of officers, the site is not in reasonably close proximity of the community, the land could not be classified as 'local' in character and as such could be classified as an extensive tract of land. There are no public footpaths running through the woodland. A public footpath skirts along the south and east edges of the wood and as such, there is no 'general' public access to the site. Justification for the inclusion of this field relates to it being used year round by walkers, but based on footpath maps this can't be the case. The site itself may be of some historic significance but it could not be classified as demonstrably special to the community in overall terms. Since LGS designation should only be used when all the assessment criteria in the NPPF are met, the conclusion is that based on the evidence submitted, this site does not meet para 77 of NPPF and should be removed from the Plan.</p> <p>CLAV10: Site area is 0.8Ha. In the opinion of officers, the site is in reasonably close proximity to the community, since it lies on the edge of the village. The site is 'local' in character is not an extensive tract of land. It is an area used for community recreation and as such is demonstrably special to the community. It is concluded that this site does meet para 77 of NPPF and should be retained within the Plan.</p>