

David Morrison "Windrush" BS39 5RH

Morrison Comment	Does Clutton Parish Council agree with comment	Clutton Neighbourhood Plan Steering group Response
<p>My first comment is a general one in that whilst some Policies proposed are very definitive, leaving no ambiguity as to future decisions to be taken. Others suggest that they are open to interpretation and that subjectivity alone will determine what responses from the Parish Council will be made in future to matters involving the Village and Parish</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>There are some matters where it is neither appropriate nor possible to make detailed plans at this stage. However, where possible, the Clutton Neighbourhood Plan does indicate possibilities should the need be established at some future date</p>
<p>It is important that the CNP Policies are nothing other than definitive and therefore robust in order that the prescriptions within give a clarity to the wishes of the Community for the length of the Plan.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>This has been done as far as is practical without prejudicing future actions of the Parish Council.</p>
<p>The Plan will hopefully last intact beyond the period of the current Parish Officials, who are custodians of drawing up the plan which will affect Clutton and Parish and District Council decisions for a minimum of three Parish terms. If the plan is to cover 15 years, the Plan needs to be very robust and clear. Policies must be unambiguous or they are open to interpretation and more easily challenged.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>The CNP has being produced is close co-operation and consultation with BANES Planning Department and a professional planning advisor approved by the Government. We are therefore confident that it is sound and can be robustly defended.</p>
<p>The second concerns the apparent over-sight of the importance of keeping Clutton Village as a village at the heart of the Parish</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Clutton is an RA1 settlement and as such is planned to accommodate 50 new dwellings during the new local plan period which started in 2011. Since that time</p>

<p>Community. The emphasis of the Plan seems to be expanding and dispersing the village of Clutton rather than increasing its strength of identity and providing community infrastructure for the existing community where traditionally infrastructure for village communities would be found at the centre and that centre accessible for all.</p>		<p>permission has been granted for 60 dwellings plus 3 more which were not yet started. As a result there is no requirement for any more in addition to these and the Parish Council does not have plans to support additional housing unless it is on brownfield land or infill within the Housing Development Boundary.</p>
<p>Clutton could easily be an exemplar of community life if there were some guidance from the Parish to achieve this and where better than through a Neighbourhood plan that looks perhaps more holistically than it appears it currently does.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The CNP is charged with producing policies relating solely to the use of land. The CNP is not permitted to deal with social issues or even such matters as bus routes or speed limits.</p>
<p>There are interestingly no real regeneration building Policies or potential planning gain opportunities to support and enhance community infrastructure, community development or Social Cohesion. In fact much emphasis seems to be placed on moving what would be traditionally a sustainable village with amenities to providing future community infrastructure and housing outside of the true village boundary on the other side of the A37 lorry route. Yes there are clear advantages to a transport route but emphasis of the Plan should be trying to build a sustainable community for Clutton not a commuter belt town.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The results of the consultation showed a clear preference for little or no additional housing development. Clutton has met its housing number requirement for the local plan without the need for further development. Only if required by BANES at some future date, would development be considered outside the current Housing Development Boundary. The fact is that the vast majority of villagers have to travel to work and shop outside Clutton. There are very few shops and these are unable to provide the normal daily needs of residents. Services such as the doctors' surgery and secondary level schools are all distant. The use of private cars in Clutton is both higher than the average in England but also higher than the norm for BANES. This is damaging to the environment as well as choking up the roads in the village so we must ensure that, in considering the location of new dwellings, buses are as far as possible, easy to access to promote their use as an attractive alternative.</p>

<p>The sustainable employment opportunities within Clutton now exists predominately on the outskirts to the East of the Village, yet the Plan suggests housing should be built on the outskirts to the West of the village, over a mile away. It would be helpful if more consideration were given to the connectivity of new housing and work and vice versa for the Parish as a whole.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The majority of employed people work outside the parish of Clutton. The largest industrial employment site in the parish is in Marsh Lane. It is over 1.3 kilometres from the southern edge of Clutton HDB. Those working there almost exclusively use cars and vans to reach it and there are reported problems of congestion and conflict in traffic using Marsh Lane.</p>
<p>The draft Policy seems to have been drawn up contrary in crucial places to the results of the Parish survey in relation to future housing and there are contradictions currently in different policies proposed that would easily be challenged. For instance where 72% of respondents were in favour of development within the current village housing areas and on Brownfield sites where possible and less than 10% favoured housing along the A37 corridor. The Policy of the Neighbourhood Plan has then largely interpreted that to mean housing will be supported only where it is proposed West of the A37! How can that be anything but challengeable? It may even result in Developers being successful and succeeding with infill development in the village, where respondents to the survey say that development is most needed, regardless of where the current Neighbourhood Plan proposal might subjectively lead us to believe us, they will support housing.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The CNP is fully supportive of development within the Housing Development Boundary on brown field land and infill sites. The largest available brownfield site is that of the former Bromillow's Transport. This site was vigorously supported for development by the Parish Council and, subject to final agreement of the S106 payments to BANES, is expected to provide 15 dwellings of which 2 will be single bedroom.</p>
<p>For the current Parish to then go onto say that building on green field or worse Green Belt</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan has to be compliant with overarching B&NES policies and government guidelines.</p>

<p>land would be acceptable in certain circumstances begs the question are we to remain a rural cohesive village community? There is a danger that if Parishes show willingness to provide housing or even suggest it in their Neighbourhood Plans that they will accept green field development, then Central Government will pounce on the opportunity to realise the dream of meeting the three million new homes target and the parish will end up with housing well outside of its control. I strongly suggest that the Plan give greater emphasis to identifying where housing might go in support of the results of the survey. Further and importantly identify very clear boundaries, not just between Clutton and Temple Cloud, but around the whole of the village of where development would not go and state very robustly why.</p>		<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraphs 53 & 54 strongly discourage the development of residential gardens, but Rural Exception Sites Outside the HDB are encouraged. In the absence of available sites within the HDB of the village such as infill or brownfield, there is no alternative but to consider other sites. However, the need to build on green field sites is not envisaged under the current requirements for housing as laid down in BANES local plan. Nevertheless, it is prudent to consider possible general locations in case there were to be any, as yet unforeseen, changes in BANES policy which might require Clutton to take additional houses over the next 20 years.</p>
<p>More emphasis needs to be placed in the Clutton Neighbourhood Plan on supporting moving the Route of the A37 away from the village. Perhaps then infilling the very structurally solid new boundary created by the new road rather than locating housing west of the current A37, the other side of the current lorry "river" route. Which will only achieve the isolating of that small community from the rest of Clutton Village. And potentially puts no definitive rigid boundary to future development. For the plan not to contain definite boundaries all round then the wishes of the community to cap at between 6 to 40 houses, ideally 10 to 15, built will not be achieved. The Draft Clutton Neighbourhood Plan needs to be tightened up more if it is to</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>The alternative route for the A37 has been identified as the Clutton By-Pass. This has been on the strategic plans for over 50 years and it is thought extremely unlikely that it will ever be built. It is currently under review and we may learn more of the likelihood of its coming into being in the near future. The statement that the CNP does not contain definite boundaries is mistaken. The boundary line, outside which development is not normally permitted, is the Housing Development Boundary (HDB). This boundary is strictly enforced by BANES to prevent urban sprawl. Under the CNP, there will be no development outside this boundary.</p>

be robust and truly reflect the wishes of the Parish constituents who filled in the questionnaire.		
--	--	--