

# **North Somerset Council**

## **REPORT TO THE EXECUTIVE**

**DATE OF MEETING: 20 JUNE 2017**

**SUBJECT OF REPORT: CLAVERHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN SUBMISSION VERSION**

**TOWN OR PARISH: YATTON**

**OFFICER/MEMBER PRESENTING: CLLR ELFAN AP REES**

**KEY DECISION: NO**

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

North Somerset Council resolve that the Claverham Neighbourhood Development Plan meets the criteria necessary under Schedule 4B of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act (as amended) and can proceed to publicity and examination.

That North Somerset Council's comments on the submitted Claverham Neighbourhood Plan as set out in the appended table are submitted to the Neighbourhood Plan examiner; and

The Director of Development and Environment be given the authority to make any subsequent changes or alterations to the Council's comments which may arise from the consultation process.

### **1. SUMMARY OF REPORT**

The Claverham Neighbourhood Plan was submitted to North Somerset Council for Examination on 9 May 2017 by Yatton Parish Council, who are the qualifying body. North Somerset Council must now consider whether (under the criteria set out in Schedule 4B of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act (as amended)) the Neighbourhood Plan can go forward to examination; arrange a period of consultation on the submitted plan and pass any resulting comments, including those of North Somerset Council to the examiner. The person undertaking the examination will be appointed by North Somerset Council with the agreement of the qualifying body.

### **2. POLICY**

A Neighbourhood Plan is prepared by the local community (with help and advice from North Somerset Council and other bodies as necessary). It will have the status of a development plan and the policies will sit under the strategic policies contained in the North Somerset Council Core Strategy. Policies in the Neighbourhood Plan will have the same status as other plans prepared by North Somerset Council such as the Core Strategy, Development Management Policies Plan and, once adopted, the Site Allocations Plan. If there is a

conflict with existing development plans, the Claverham Neighbourhood Plan will eventually take precedence as it will be a more recent plan. Where the Neighbourhood Plan is silent on an issue however then North Somerset Council's planning policies will be used for making planning decisions.

### **3. DETAILS**

#### **Background to and content of the plan**

3.1 The Claverham Neighbourhood Area was approved by North Somerset Council in April 2015, along with the Neighbourhood Area for Yatton and the community undertook consultation on a draft plan in 2016.

3.2 A neighbourhood plan is the opportunity for local people to look in more detail at planning issues of concern to them than is possible in a local plan produced by North Somerset Council. So long as the policies are in general conformity with the strategic policies of North Somerset Council's development plan then there is much flexibility in terms of what the plan can cover. Claverham is designated as an infill village within the adopted North Somerset Core Strategy, as such development is restricted to within the settlement boundary. The Claverham Neighbourhood Plan supports this designation and is in accordance with other strategic policies and otherwise restricts the content to non-strategic issues.

3.3 The plan contains policies to:-

- designate the settlement boundary,
- control the scale and character of new development,
- address the potential redevelopment of an existing large brownfield employment site to the east of the village outside the settlement boundary (UTAS Claverham),
- address foul and surface water drainage,
- support renewable energy,
- support improvement to highways safety and public transport and address parking issues
- protect existing community facilities
- protect biodiversity and the historic environment and existing important trees
- allocate two areas as Local Green Space

3.4 The examiner will assess the plan based on a number of fixed criteria – these are referred to as the 'basic conditions':-

- Must be appropriate having regard to national policy
- Must contribute to the achievement of sustainable development
- Must be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan for the area
- Must be compatible with human rights requirements
- Must be compatible with EU obligations in that it is not likely to have a significant effect on a European site (as defined by the Conservation of Habitat and Species regulation 2010 (d)).

#### **Does the submitted Plan meet the necessary criteria to go forward to examination?**

3.5 Separate neighbourhood plans are being prepared for the villages of Yatton and Claverham, however Yatton Parish Council is the qualifying body for both plans (i.e. the

plans are both being prepared under the authority of Yatton Parish Council). Together the plans cover the whole of Yatton parish. The Yatton Neighbourhood Plan is not at the same stage of development as is the Claverham Plan, however there has been liaison between the two plan groups and it is not considered that any of the content of the Claverham Plan adversely affects the preparation of the Yatton Plan or vice-versa. It is therefore in order for the Claverham Neighbourhood Plan to proceed in advance of the Yatton Neighbourhood Plan. For the Claverham Neighbourhood Plan to be able to go forward to examination North Somerset Council must decide whether the plan meets the following criteria:-

1. Whether the Parish Council is authorised to act (is the parish council for that area)
2. Whether the proposal and accompanying documents:-
  - a) are the correct documents under regulation 15 of the neighbourhood planning regulations 2012 (i.e. a plan of the neighbourhood area, basic condition statement, consultation statement, the proposed plan).
  - b) meets the definition of a neighbourhood development plan.
  - c) meets the scope of provisions (i.e. specifies the period for which it is to have effect, doesn't include excluded development, doesn't relate to more than one neighbourhood area).
3. Whether the parish council has undertaken the correct procedures in relation to consultation and publicity.

3.6 The Plan submitted by Yatton Parish Council meets all these obligations and therefore the plan can now proceed to a minimum six week period for publicity and then to examination.

### **North Somerset Council's response to the plan**

3.7 North Somerset Officers have been involved in the preparation of the plan and officers from the planning applications teams, planning policy, economic development, transport and highways, sustainability, flooding and drainage and natural and historic environment teams have offered advice on both technical matters and policy making. The draft Neighbourhood Plan underwent a pre-submission health check by an independent examiner in October 2016. A number of amendments were made to the plan in response to these inputs. As there has been constructive dialogue between the plan makers and officers of North Somerset Council throughout the development of the Plan, with the majority of suggestions and comments already taken on board, there are very few further comments to make on the Plan itself. Any additional comments in response to recent rewording of the plan are included in the appendix to this report, as are comments on the content of the Basic Conditions Statement and the Statement of Consultation. North Somerset Council now have the final opportunity to make comments on the submitted plan which will be passed to the examiner, along with those responses received to consultation.

3.8 In the main the comments relate to potential improvements to the policies to make them more effective e.g. where there is imprecise wording, or ambiguity, or to strengthen the policy. This especially relates to the Environment policy ENV1 and supporting text.

3.9 There are two exceptions, the first relating to a flooding/drainage policy DR1, where officers consider that the policy as written would not comply with planning application requirements and place too onerous a burden on planning applicants at too early a stage in the planning process. The second relates to policy D3, the most significant policy within the Plan and one which officers consider wo

uld benefit from further clarity. This policy relates to an existing employment site (UTAS Claverham), which will become vacant by the end of this year. The Plan identifies this site as suitable for mixed use, or residential use should the re-use for employment purposes be shown to be unviable. The site lies outside the settlement boundary and in part constitutes previously developed land. The Council's draft Site Allocations Plan does not specifically allocate the site for any use as this provides the opportunity for the local community take the lead on what local preferences for re-use would be. The re-use for mixed employment and residential or residential uses in the Neighbourhood Plan is supported by planning and economic development officers. It has also broadly been supported in principle by the current site owners who are currently marketing the site. The proposed North Somerset comments as set out in the Appendix to this report relate to the desirability of tightening up the wording of the policy to ensure it achieves community aspirations.

3.10 Comments on the Statement of Consultation. One of this Council's duties is to check that adequate and correct consultation has been undertaken by the community in the preparation of the Plan. A Statement of Consultation has been produced, as required which sets out the measures taken to involve the local community on a number of occasions. Some of the necessary information is contained in the Basic Conditions Statement and therefore cross referencing is needed. Clarification has been received that no responses were received from the local community to the formal consultation undertaken prior to submission, as this explanation is missing from the Statement. Although this is somewhat surprising, the Statement of Consultation does demonstrate that attempts were made to engage with the community at this stage. Earlier consultation demonstrates a higher level of active involvement and the health check examiner acknowledged this. There is additional discussion of the consultation undertaken and how comments were addressed contained within the Basic Conditions Statement. This is largely in relation to the consultation bodies, the Statement itself and appendices indicates that public votes were taken in relation to the draft policies and responses used in the final drafting of the plan. Although the presentation of the consultation undertaken is a little fragmented it is possible to ascertain that a large amount of work was undertaken in order to involve the community in the preparation of the plan. Officers are therefore satisfied that the correct consultation procedures have been followed.

#### **4. CONSULTATION**

Claverham Neighbourhood Plan group have engaged with the local community in the early stages of preparing the plan and have undertaken statutory consultation on the draft plan prior to submitting it to North Somerset Council for examination. North Somerset officers have been involved in the Plan's development and the Council has the opportunity at this time to make final comments on the submitted plan. North Somerset Council must now undertake a formal six weeks period of consultation on the submitted plan prior to examination.

#### **5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

North Somerset Council can retrospectively claim £20k following a successful examination of the Plan to cover the cost of examination and holding the referendum. Payments will be made under section 31 of the Local Government Act 2003 (and in respect of National Parks Authorities under section 72 of the Environment Act 1995 and in respect of the Broads Authority under section 15 of the Norfolk and Suffolk Broads Act 19881). The claim period for this will be December 2017.

## **6. RISK MANAGEMENT**

There is potential for the Plan to be unsuccessful at examination should the examiner consider that the plan is not capable of meeting the basic conditions even without specified modifications. In this case the Council would not be able to claim the £20k funding under the above act. In practice it is very rare occurrence and officers consider that the Plan's preparation and content is sufficiently robust to pass examination (potentially with modifications).

## **7. EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS**

The Claverham Neighbourhood Plan is considered to have met the necessary Human Rights Articles and it is not considered that there are any equality impact considerations arising from the Plan.

## **8. CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS**

There are no direct implications in relation to highways/transport as the plan supports measures rather than proposing specific schemes. There may be future implications in relation to some areas of service delivery most notable through policy D3 which supports a mix of uses or residential uses on an existing employment site. In this case there may be implications in relation to education and other service delivery should residential development be delivered.

## **9. OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

As the submitted Plan is considered to meet the requirements to proceed to examination there is no option but to progress the plan.

## **AUTHOR**

Celia Dring, Principal Planning Policy Officer, Development and Environment.  
X6244

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

These links access the documents on the Claverham Neighbourhood plan website

[Submitted Claverham Neighbourhood plan](#)

[Evidence documents including Statement of Consultation and Basic Conditions Statement](#)

**Appendix to 20 June Executive report  
Claverham Neighbourhood Plan  
North Somerset Council comments on submitted plan**

North Somerset Council has offered advice and assistance throughout the Plan making process and attended steering group meetings. There has been one main link officer from the planning policy team. Input has also been made from officers in highways and transport, flood management, sustainability, natural and historic environment, economic development and the planning applications teams.

North Somerset Council commented extensively on the consultation draft produced in 2016 and many of the suggestions and comments have been incorporated into the revised submitted Plan. In areas where the plan has remained unchanged and /or North Somerset Council consider that improvements are warranted to help make policies effective and deliverable then these have been stated in the table below.

<b>Para/policy</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Objective 10 Green Belt	14	Strategic issue-relevance of including?
Para 8-Ref to Site allocation plan policy SA6	20	Should read “Draft”..... Site Allocations plan policy SA6.
D3.5, Site PS1 And supporting text	25	<p>1. <b>Policy wording of D3.5 would merit tightening up to remove any ambiguity.</b> The intention appears to be to allocate the site although the policy wording would merit clarity and specifically use the word “allocation” in preference to current wording of “the policy supports...” P26 of Basic Conditions Statement second bullet point last sentence demonstrates that the intention is to “allocate” ie “Claverham residents have decided that the site can be used for a number of development types and are <b>designating</b> it for mixed use or housing...” It would therefore be appropriate to remove any prospect of ambiguity by replacing “supports” with “allocates”. This would also then comply with the Ministerial Statement HCWS346 of 12 Dec 2016 and the need to actually allocate housing sites in order to trigger assessment against a three year housing land supply. It would also benefit from clarification of what is meant by “mixed uses” ie “to include housing and employment”-see 5 below.</p> <p>2. <b>Erroneous need to comply with Site Allocations Plan SA6 /Replacement Local Plan E/5 approach</b></p>

		<p>The plan's wording implies a need to comply with Site Allocation Plan policy SA6 or adopted Replacement Local Plan policy E/5, to first establish non-viability for employment uses prior to other uses being considered. SA 6 and E/5 are non-strategic policies and NSC are of the view that D3 does not have to comply with this if there is a community aspiration for mixed use. The Neighbourhood Plan policy would take precedence.</p> <p>3. <b>Viability of employment uses</b> NSC economic development officers have concluded that given the location and the size of the site combined with historical demand, it is unlikely to be of interest for re-use or redevelopment for other economic uses. It is considered that a policy for mixed use housing and employment is a sensible approach and would allow for the opportunity of some employment re-use if viable.</p> <p>4. <b>Specific allocation of this brownfield site</b> would accord with North Somerset Council's Core Strategy approach without conflict and be supported by NPPF para 22 and 51.</p> <p>5. <b>Community preference for mixed use on PS1.</b> Evidence from community consultation shows a strong preference for mixed use, rather than for other employment uses, or only residential. Appendices to Statement of Consultation p89 –the village survey in relation to the UTAS site 53% of responses favoured mixed use, opposed to only 31.38% for only employment and 15.33% for only residential. Statement of Consultation p13 states “for the UTC employment site a clear majority would prefer redevelopment to be mixed use”.</p> <p>6. <b>Clarification of mixed use</b> Since the intention of the Plan appears to be in favour of affording an opportunity for residential development on this brownfield site in preference to other greenfield sites, it would be prudent to specify this by specifying “housing” as one of the mixed uses. Para 4 p20 indicates a desire “to provide positive contribution to the provision of housing”. Similarly on p24 last paragraph second sentence “this sole opportunity to be used wisely for part of the housing supply”. And last sentence “The houses delivered will.....existing families to live in our community”. A specific allocation for “mixed use of residential and employment would therefore accord with the communities stated aspirations. A mixed use allocation which specifies housing and employment</p>
--	--	---

		<p>also gives flexibility to respond to market demands and viability of employment uses.</p> <p>NSC do not consider there is realistic chance of a new single economic use for the site. The site owners are currently marketing the site however to comply with draft policy SA6 and saved Replacement Plan policy E/5</p> <p><b>Recommended modifications</b></p> <p><b>Objective 5</b> delete after “provided...”</p> <p><b>Policy D3 reworded</b> to say “This policy <b>allocates mixed use including housing and employment use....</b>” and delete after “..observed...”.</p> <p><b>First para of 9.3</b> Delete second sentence “Provided that..... accepted”.</p> <p><b>Second and third to last para p20</b> Delete “ Site Allocations Plan Policy SA6.....would not be viable” and also delete “Should....for employment uses”.</p>
D3 1.	25	Query whether reasonable to say “all trees” etc should be maintained, preserved and protected without qualification?
DR1	28	<p>It is understood that the objective of the policy is to avoid the case where planning consent may be given in principle without sufficient detail to ensure that it is possible to devise a satisfactory drainage scheme. Officers have previously commented on this text with the objective of ensuring in meeting this objective it reflects existing <a href="#">planning application requirements</a> and does not place an unreasonable burden on planning applicants at too early a stage in the planning process.</p> <p>Replacement supporting text and policy insert after third para:-</p> <p>“To discharge planning conditions, drainage scheme details relevant to the scale and stage of the application will be required and should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Layout drawings, drainage layout and landscape proposals</li> <li>b) Hydraulic calculations and design drawings</li> <li>c) Structural and ground investigations including infiltration results</li> <li>f) Evidence of third party agreement for outfall to their system or to cross land</li> <li>g) Development Management and Construction Phasing</li> <li>h) Maintenance programme with details of on-going maintenance responsibilities and funding</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy DR1</b></p> <p>1. New development should include sustainable drainage systems with long term storage provision to reduce or ensure there is no increase in surface water run-off to ensure that the development does not increase the flood risk.</p>

		<p>2. Pumped schemes for surface water drainage are strongly discouraged and will not be accepted for schemes with more than 9 dwellings without full on-line back-up equipment and standby power supplies to ensure continued drainage in the event of mains failure. Furthermore if a site, and its pumped drainage is to be in multiple ownership, i.e. a series of freeholds, a long-term maintenance funding scheme and plan for the lifetime of the development is to be provided.”</p>
R1	30	Add <i>Biodiversity and Trees SPD (2005)</i> to the list of SPD's
T2	34	<p>Item 1. “minimises traffic movements” in policy T2 is very difficult to apply or measure and therefore is not appropriate.</p> <p>Also query whether use of roads for recreation and their character are road safety issues. Perhaps better suited to a separate policy about retaining walls and hedges etc. as policy ENV2 with reference to retaining character. If the intention is to support walking, cycling etc. then suggest something similar to DM25 in Development Management Sites and Policies Plan part 1 to protect and enhance existing walking, cycling and bridleway network and ensure the provision of new and improved multi-user routes connecting with new development.</p> <p>As a comment on item 4. In T2, it needs to be pointed out that “SLOW” signs would need to be justified on case by case basis.</p>
T3	35	Under T3 Parking, item 2 references the NSC Parking Standards SPD, however the availability of on-street parking is assessed on a case by case basis in terms of whether it can be used to offset on-site provision, rather than a blanket policy precluding this.
ENV1 12.1	40	<p>Para 2 line 2 –support the intentions of the wording however in place of this the following wording would be more accurate:-</p> <p>‘The Plan area supports legally protected species, notably horseshoe bats, as it is located within 1km of the maternity and hibernation roosts comprising King’s Wood and Urchin Wood SSSI; and within 2km of the maternity roost for horseshoe bats at Brockley Hall stables. These horseshoe bat roosts comprise components of the North Somerset and Mendip Bats Special Area of Conservation (SAC), which is a European site of international importance. Therefore, North Somerset Council is working with Natural England and the Somerset County Council ecologist to produce specific guidance for developers in relation to this SAC (North Somerset and Mendip Bat SAC Technical Guidance). The guidance has been produced to explain how developments within different areas (or zones) may impact on the SAC</p>

		<p>components, and the steps required to avoid or mitigate such impacts. The area to the south of Claverham falls within a 1km Juvenile Sustenance Zone, which is set in the guidance around the maternity (breeding) roosts, in this case the roosts within King’s Wood and Urchin Wood, a zone of high significance for supporting juvenile horseshoe bats’.</p>
	P40	<p>Para 5, line 2 Whilst again the intention is supported this sentence has resource implications for YACWAG and could be potentially misleading as to what is generally required for development management. Where applications have potential to impact any species of bat, applicants are required to engage suitably experienced and licensed ecological consultants to undertake building inspections and/or undertake other types of bat surveys as necessary. The following text would therefore be more appropriate:</p> <p>‘For planning proposals with potential to impact bats or their roosting, commuting or foraging habitats, applicants are required to engage suitably experienced licensed bat ecologists to undertake building inspections and bat surveys/assessments as necessary. These survey and mitigation assessments need to be undertaken in line with national guidance, notably the Bat Conservation Trust’s <i>Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists – Good Practice Guidelines</i> (2016) and <i>Bat Mitigation Guidelines</i> (English Nature 2004); and also with with mitigation and assessment set out line local guidance, such as the North Somerset’s <i>Biodiversity and Trees SPD</i> (2005) and also the emerging the North Somerset and Mendip Bat SAC Technical Guidance, once it has been formally adopted. Planning applications within Claverham Neighbourhood Plan area may be further informed by reference to the results of ongoing bat surveys undertaken by YACWAG or YPC.’</p>
ENV1	42	<p>This is positive but recommend some minor amendment as the requirements indicated are less than those within the North Somerset’s Development Management Policy DM8 and NSC would not wish to see a weakening of protection for protected species.</p> <p>The correct protection would be afforded by amending the text as follows:</p> <p><i>“Development which could harm, directly or indirectly, species, which are legally protected, or species and habitats that have been identified as Species or Habitats of Principal Importance in England (also known as Section 41 or ‘Priority’ species and habitats) will not be permitted unless the harm can be avoided or mitigated by appropriate measures.”</i></p> <p>To provide more local focus, it would be useful to add:  <i>“Opportunities could also be sought to restore/re-create priority habitats that will also support local biodiversity and</i></p>

		<p><i>key local species, such as horseshoe bats and potentially dormice”.</i></p> <p>For bullet 4: to include some of the text of DM8 as follows: <i>Where appropriate, proposals should seek to conserve the local natural environment by retaining, protecting, enhancing, and linking existing wildlife habitats; by incorporating retained habitats sensitively into the development through appropriate design; and by ensuring that such retained and enhanced habitats are managed appropriately. Where necessary, longer term management will be achieved through suitable planning conditions’.</i> To provide an added value or additional opportunity to create habitats for key local species, the word ‘<i>creating</i>’ could be considered after ‘<i>enhancing</i>’ in line 2.</p> <p>To add local context to this policy a foot note could be added as follows “Priority habitats that could be considered locally which would also function to support key local species detected in the area, particularly horseshoe bats and potentially dormice include: species rich hedgerow, which also needs to be managed to grow to at least 3m to provide a sheltered microclimate for bat foraging, with overgrown sections which are used by greater horseshoe bats. Hedgerows trimmed on a longer rotation, wherever possible, will allow the shrubs to flower and produce berries, to produce resources to support insects, bats, birds and dormice. Further, opportunities to undertake grassland restoration of meadows/pasture to Lowland Meadow priority habitat (a neutral species rich grassland), would also support an abundance and diversity of insect life for bat and bird foraging. Otherwise any pasture that is used for grazing stock, but particularly cattle that are not treated with Ivermectin wormer, provides a habitat with key insect prey of high importance for juvenile horseshoe bats.”</p> <p>Local examples of National Priority Species could include species such as: hedgehog, brown hare, common toad, sparrow, and skylark. Further examples are listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006).</p>
ENV3	44	Grammatical amendment needed – omit “trees within..” before “..the site shown herein as LGS1...” and capitalise “The”...
ENV4	45	Text at end of first line on page 45 should read “....North Somerset Council’s Sites Space Allocations plan...”

### Basic conditions statement

Although there are a number of factual points to raise in relation to the Basic Conditions Statement as set out in the table below, it is not considered that there is any conflict with the approach or policies of North Somerset Council’s strategic policies. Similarly no material inconsistencies have been identified between the Plan and the NPPF or NPPG.

Section/para	Page	Comment
Conformity With NPPF- “promoting healthy communities”	27	Omits to mention that the Health Check Examiner raised concerns that Local Green Space LGS 1 May Day Field was not well evidenced and that this has been addressed in the evidence base document bundle L page 129-132. North Somerset Council has also allocated the site for Local Green Space in the Site Allocations Plan which is currently at examination stage.
Para 7.1	30/31	List of North Somerset Development Plan documents. The Site Allocations Plan (submission version February 2017)” is correctly referenced but should replace the incorrectly referenced version of the document under the “Draft Plans” sections below it.  The “West of England Joint Spatial Plan ( <del>Issues and Options winter 2015/16</del> ) (Towards an emerging spatial strategy) November 2016
7.1 third last para.	31	Update to last sentence- text amended to read “The emerging Sites and Policies plan part 2 Site Allocations <del>is only at consultation draft stage and</del> at examination stage and therefore <del>has limited</del> should be afforded significant weight in decision making.
Table 2	33	Title incorrect “relevant selected <del>core strategy</del> Sites and Policies part 1 Development Management Policies”
Table 3 policy D3 Site PS1	36	The Neighbourhood Plan allocation of PS1 gives preference to economic uses, however should these not be viable then mixed use is accepted, followed by residential use. Core Strategy policy CS33 does not make specific mention of re-use of previously developed sites outside settlement boundaries so the plan’s approach does not contain conflict. The approach broadly follows that in Core Strategy policy CS20 which gives priority to re-use of previously developed sites, and safeguarding of sites already in economic use. This also mirrors the approach in North Somerset Council’s submitted Site Allocations Plan policy SA 6. Although the likely scale of development on PS1 is above the scale of development which may be expected adjacent to an infill village, neither the NPPF or development plan policies preclude this approach, as the site is previously developed. NPPF para 17 bullet 8 encourages the reuse of brownfield land provided it is not of high environmental value. D3 follows this approach and seeks to protect an existing green boundary to the built development which the local community consider is of high environmental value. Omits reasoning for taking a different approach to the site from that advocated by the Health Check examiner. The Health Check examiner’s report indicated that a site allocation may generate the need for alternative site assessment. North Somerset Council does not consider this to be correct in this case, or necessary, as it does not represent the allocation of a greenfield site in order to meet

		housing land requirements, but supports a potential redevelopment of an existing employment site should alternative economic uses be demonstrated to be unviable. There are no other brownfield sites surrounding Claverham against which to undertake a comparative site assessment. As set out above the strategic planning context does not contradict this approach. The Neighbourhood Plan applies the same rationale to any proposals for future development that would be applied by North Somerset Council in the assessment of a planning application for redevelopment. See comments on Plan relating to policy wording changes considered necessary to achieve clarity.
Para 7.1	30/31	List of North Somerset Development Plan documents The “Sites Allocations Plan (submission version February 2017)” is correctly referenced but should replace the incorrectly referenced version of the document under the “Draft Plans” sections below it.  The “West of England Joint Spatial Plan ( <del>Issues and Options winter 2015/16</del> ) (Towards an emerging spatial strategy) November 2016
Compatibility with EU regulations (inc. SEA/HRA	46	The inclusion of the response from statutory bodies to the SEA/HRA screening would be useful, as confirmation that neither an SEA or HRA could be needed and should be forwarded to the Examiner with this response from North Somerset Council.

### Statement of Consultation

A Statement of Consultation has been produced, as required which sets out the measures taken to involve the local community on a number of occasions. Some of the necessary information is contained in the Basic Conditions Statement and therefore cross referencing is needed. Clarification has been received that no responses were received from the local community to the formal consultation undertaken prior to submission, as this explanation is missing from the Statement. Although this is somewhat surprising, the Statement of Consultation does demonstrate that attempts were made to engage with the community at this stage. Earlier consultation demonstrates a higher level of active involvement and the health check examiner acknowledged this.

There is additional discussion of the consultation undertaken and how comments were addressed contained within the Basic Conditions Statement. This is largely in relation to the consultation bodies, the Statement itself and appendices indicates that public votes were taken in relation to the draft policies and responses used in the final drafting of the plan. Although the presentation of the consultation undertaken is a little fragmented it is possible to ascertain that a large amount of work was undertaken in order to involve the community in the preparation of the plan. More clarity could have been given in respect of some aspects of the plan which have changed from consultation draft stage to submission stage following receipt of consultation responses as follows in the table below. Also it is necessary to cross reference with the Basic Conditions Statement pages 4-16 to get a fuller picture of how comments were addressed in the final version of the Plan.

Section/para/policy	page	Comment
SEA/HRA comments	Gladman P55	Response confirmed that statutory consultees considered no SEA needed but recommended

		<p>that SA should be carried out to highlight any gaps where the plan may not promote sustainable development.</p> <p>The Statement omits to say that this is neither a requirement nor necessary as the only development site within the plan relates to the re-use of an existing brownfield site, provided criteria are met.</p>
Pre-submission consultation	Historic England P48	<p>Response confirmed that no SEA is required, but queried use of “maintained” instead of “retained” in policy D3.</p> <p>Neighbourhood plan reaction-submitted plan wording is now “retained”. Also policy ENV2 seeks protection and where possible enhancement of heritage assets.</p>
Pre-submission consultation	Community response P15	<p>Clairification has been received that no responses were received from the local community to the formal consultation undertaken prior to submission as this is missing from the consultation statement. Officers are therefore satisfied that the correct consultation procedures have been followed.</p>