

Chew Valley Area Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation

The following page presents a summary, written by Officers at Bath and North East Somerset Council, of the comments made during the Regulation 16 consultation on the Chew valley Area Neighbourhood Plan, which took place between 26th July 2016-20th September 2016. The summary is written to provide assistance to the Examiner and to allow anyone who wishes to see some of the issues raised. It does not contain every point a consultee has made. The Examiner will read the comments of each consultee in full.

Name of the Consultee/ Organisation	Date the comment was received	Comment format	Plan Ref	Pg. no.	Comments made
Jacqui Ashman, West of England Growth & Improvement Asset Manager Highways England	01.08.2016	Email	N/A	N/A	Good morning Thank you for giving Highways England the opportunity to comment on the Chew Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan. We have reviewed the documents on the website and note that the geographical area covered by the plan is located some distance from the strategic road network for which we are responsible. We are content that the plan as drafted would not have an adverse impact on the strategic road network we therefore have no comments to make on it. Regards Jacqui
Joanna Foster Planning Officer Spatial Planning Economic Development & Planning Wiltshire Council	08.08.2016	Email	N/A	N/A	Hi, Thank you for consulting Wiltshire Council, we have no comment to make on the Chew Valley Neighbourhood Plan. Many thanks, Jo
Phillip Hales Secretary Chew Valley Flood Forum	06.09.2016	Email	HDE9a and 9b	32	The CVFF welcomes policies HDE9a and 9b in the section on Sustainable Drainage to Minimise Flooding. However the draft plan omits a policy the CVFF wished included, namely that any new development of dwellings and their access roads in Flood Zone 3 will not be supported. An example of why it is essential that this is explicitly stated in the Plan was the recent auction of a parcel of land in front of Tunbridge Mill in Chew

					Magna. The auctioneer's advertising stated the land had "huge potential" and is "ideal for residential development"- yet it is in Flood Zone 3 and adjacent to two existing "60s" houses on the River Chew bank, which were built with the living accommodation on the first floor, due to the flood risk!
Phillip Hales Secretary Chew Valley Flood Forum	06.09.2016	Email	HDE9a and 9b	32	Policy HDE9c is not as the CVFF proposed. The word "minor" has been erroneously added regarding alterations and additions to existing houses to mitigate flooding. "Minor" alterations generally do not need planning approval, and therefore the policy as currently drafted with this qualification, would be pointless. The CVFF proposal was that the Neighbourhood Plan will support and encourage alterations and additions to existing houses at risk of flooding that will help mitigate that risk and make the buildings more flood resilient. This should apply to all such work, even if it is substantial, as we need to reduce the impact of flooding on existing houses
M L Hales Chew Magna	06.09.2016	Email	HDE12a & HDE13	38-40	Dear Sir/Madam I have the following comments on the pre-submission draft of the Chew Valley Neighbourhood Plan that has been submitted to B&NES. As currently drafted the Policy HDE13 on Green Corridors and Biodiversity is too limited and insufficiently robust. The Neighbourhood Plan should state that development proposals will not be supported where they directly or indirectly have an adverse impact on existing Sites of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCIs) and UK Priority Habitats. This would mirror policy HDE12a Tree and Ancient Hedgerow Conservation. There is no mention nor map of the Strategic Nature Area extending south of Chew Magna, towards Chew Stoke. This omission should be rectified, as it is the area covered by the Neighbourhood Plan where maintenance,

					restoration and expansion of wildlife habitats can best be achieved. This should be stated in the Plan.
M L Hales Chew Magna	06.09.2016	Email	Appendix 4	91	<p>Appendix 4, which includes the Parish Wildlife Surveys should ensure the maps are standardised to ensure all key designations are shown on all map, such as SNCIs, Priority Habitats and notable species. There is a distinct adhoc nature within this appendix.</p> <p>For example unlike all other parish maps, the Chew Magna map does not show notable species. Of more concern is the inclusion of and highlighting of the word “Draft” preceding SNCI on the Chew Magna map key. The word “draft” should be deleted. I am not aware of any policy changes regarding the designation of the SNCIs in Chew Magna as shown in the Policy Maps saved from the Local Plan and incorporated into the adopted Core Strategy. If there has been any change to the SNCIs’ status I would be grateful if you would tell me why and what this means for protecting these sites in Chew Magna.</p> <p>Also of some concern is the complete absence of amplifying/descriptive notes accompanying the Chew Magna Hedgerow and Wildlife maps in Appendix 4. This is inconsistent with the other village’s maps and effort should be made to obtain notes to back up the maps. The Wildlife maps in Appendix 4 should be moved into the body of the Plan to give them more weight in planning terms.</p>
B&NES Development management Team	15.09.2016	Email	HDE2	18	This policy would benefit by referring to Village Design Statements and the character assessments and requiring compliance with them.
B&NES Development management Team	15.09.2016	Email	HDE3	20	This policy needs to be reworded so that development proposals are required to protect and preserve the <i>identified</i> protected views.

B&NES Development management Team	15.09.2016	Email	HDE4	26	Any proposed development that has an impact upon key the skyline views shall must be of a height, scale and mass which is sensitive to these views the skyline.
B&NES Development management Team	15.09.2016	Email	HDE6a	28	The majority of the Neighbourhood Plan area is in the Green Belt; the policy needs to be clear that this policy is to be applied in the context of wider NPPF/Core Strategy policies relating to the Green Belt.
B&NES Development management Team	15.09.2016	Email	HDE6b	28	The policy needs to state which development types it applies to (i.e. residential/commercial/householder applications etc.) as well as whether it applies exclusively to new-build or whether changes of use are included.
B&NES Development management Team	15.09.2016	Email	HDE7	28	This policy requires the submission (and implementation) of a Traffic Impact Assessment but does not actually require it to meet with the Council's approval. The policy needs to be reworded to clarify that the submitted TIA must <u>satisfactorily</u> demonstrate that the highway network can safely accommodate the increase in traffic associated with the development.
B&NES Development management Team	15.09.2016	Email	HDE8a	30	It should also require the design to incorporate a <u>satisfactory or acceptable system</u> for surface water disposal not simply 'a' system.
B&NES Development management Team	15.09.2016	Email	HDE9a	32	It needs to refer to an <u>acceptable</u> sustainable drainage system. The word 'fully' is problematic, a drainage system is either sustainable or it is not; as stated the important thing is that it is acceptable not whether it is 'fully' sustainable.
B&NES Development management Team	15.09.2016	Email	HDE14a	40	The policy does not specify the type of risk concerned. Presumably (from the title) the policy is concerned about ecological risk but this should be in the wording of the policy itself.
B&NES Development	15.09.2016	Email	HDE15	43	Where planning permission is required Development must: • Design lighting to minimise the risk of light spillage beyond the

management Team					development site boundary and into the wider countryside and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate appropriate dark corridors for bats and other light sensitive species <p>The policy does not need to state, “<i>where planning permission is required</i>” because if it is not the NP has no weight.</p>
B&NES Development management Team	15.09.2016	Email	BF1	47	The policy should also be clear that the support it offers is <i>in principle</i> only as clearly farm diversification schemes will be assessed against a much broader range of material considerations than just those listed in the policy
B&NES Development management Team	15.09.2016	Email	BF2	48	Where planning permission is required the Neighbourhood Plan will only support planning applications for change of use from any business if there is a feasibility and marketing study to indicate other business or employment uses are not viable in the premises. (The methodology of the feasibility and marketing studies undertaken by the developer and the extent of the evidence required to allow consideration for change of use would need to be approved by the Parish Council in which the development lies). The policy does not need to state, “ <i>where planning permission is required</i> ” because if it is not the NP has no weight.
Andrew Pearce B&NES Environment Team	19.09.2016	Email	HDE10	34	Policy HDE10 Community Publically Accessible Green Space Design The Neighbourhood Plan will support developments where the layout includes communal Publically Accessible green areas/allotments/orchards/copses. Reason – To ensure on-site greenspace typologies benefit the wider community, rather than solely for the community within the development itself.
David Stuart Historic Places	20.09.2016	Email	N/A	N/A	Dear Sir/Madam Thank you for your consultation on the Chew Valley

Adviser South West					<p>Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We commented on a draft version of the Plan earlier in the year in our response to your authority's consultation on the associated SEA.</p> <p>We have no additional comments to make at this time other than to reiterate how impressed we are with the demonstration of the depth and scope of knowledge of the area's historic character and the extent to which this has been used to inform policies within the Plan such as those on built character, views, skyline and hedgerows and trees.</p> <p>We therefore only wish to congratulate the community in its progress to date and wish it well in the completion of its Plan.</p>
Andy Leeder Chew Magna	20.09.2016	Email	HDE13	N/A	<p>To Whom It May Concern</p> <p>I wish to make some comments with regards to the draft Chew Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan:</p> <p>Firstly, given that within the 'Our Vision' section it states "we wish to conserve, enhance and make positive use of: • our historic environment, local character and rural setting, • the area's biodiversity (wildlife and habitats), water resources and natural environment" then the currently drafted policy HDE13 on Green Corridors and Biodiversity, apart from 3 maps, seems to be very light on content. Given its importance to this document would it not be logical to include a summary of the information contained in Appendix 4 into this section.</p> <p>Please include these comments when revieweing the document.</p>
Andy Leeder Chew Magna	20.09.2016	Email	HDE13	N/A	<p>In addition it would also seem sensible and in keeping with Policy HDE12 to include within Policy HDE 13 wording to the effect that " Development proposals will not be permitted</p>

					where they directly or indirectly have an adverse impact on Sites of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCIs), Special Protection Areas (SPAs) or Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)”
Andy Leeder Chew Magna	20.09.2016	Email	Appendix 4	91	Under Appendix 4; Why is the Chew Magna Section not in-line with the other village submissions? Surely the map format should be standardised, e.g. the same key used, to ensure clarity, and why is there a worrying lack of information and accompanying notes to the Chew Magna Hedgerow and Wildlife maps. This information needs to be ascertained and included to ensure that the wonderful biodiversity that exists within the Chew Magna Parish and the notable species are recorded as with other Parishes.