

Comments and Organisation	Discussion points for Overview Steering Group	Decisions of Parish Council Steering Group
<p>2 Hallam Land Management Taylor Wimpey UK</p> <p>H2 is the focus of this section</p>	<p>HLM/TW have considered Appendix 19 of the Neighbourhood Plan and in particular the selection process that has undertaken. HLM/TW is mindful that site H2 does not appear to have been included in that assessment.</p> <p>For the reasons set out above, most notably to ensure that Policy H2 is consistent with the strategic policies of the EDLP and Cranbrook Plan DPD, one of the following options should be employed within the policy wording.</p> <p>Option 1: an additional criterion should be added as a site specific requirement as follows: "vehicle access to the site will be provided from Cotterill Road and in any event should not include any new access taken from Station Road"</p> <p>Option 2: the last sentence of the policy should be amended to ensure general application: Instead of "*The provision of 1 and 2 above are to be designed in alignment with the Bluehayes (Cranbrook western expansion zone)" the wording should be replaced by: "Proposals for the site, including the provision of vehicle access, should be</p>	<p>H2 was the coding adopted for the Housing policy in the Draft 16 NP. This site and the other housing sites were all coded differently as seen in Appendix 19: H1 was (H3) H2 (H8) H3 (H6)</p> <p>This response to H2 focuses on access issues. At reg 14 DCC highways bought up the need to consider the Cranbrook Bluehayes site and its access. DCC highways provided a rewording of the Reg 14 policy which was adopted and is found in the asterix section of the policy.</p> <p>Option 1 provides a very closed option of "no new access" On site there is already a dropped curve infrastructure onto Shercroft Close where a field access already exists and a cycle path has been master planned by DCC to run through and from this site onto Shercroft Close. This option would not allow these accesses to be developed.</p> <p>Option 2: also provides a very closed option as the restrictions are extended beyond the specific requirements dealing with access (1 and 2). We would not like the Western Expansion to determine the proposals for the site, because such a blanket</p>

	<p>designed in alignment with the Bluehayes (Cranbrook western expansion zone)"</p>	<p>covering could include decisions on housing landscaping, new hedgerow cyclepath, children’s play park etc . The Focus must remain on “access”, which was the only issue raised.</p> <p>Happy for examiner to adjust and tighten up on the access wording which was provided by DCC highways.</p>
NE6		<p>Already agreed for the final section of the policy to go into supporting text.</p>
Policy T2		<p>Safe navigation to Broadclyst station and access of Cranbrook was a priority of the Broadclyst community & the need is being satisfied in the policy. It is not a policy to serve a specific need of Cranbrook – but could be a side benefit.</p> <p>Happy to have the suggested rewrite as the focus is on Parish needs not Cranbrook. Policy T2 has a typo – it needs to end with ‘to be supported’.</p> <p>SG do not agree with any of their other points regarding T2.</p>
3. David Lock on Behalf of HLM Taylor Wimpey Persimmon Homes - Redacted EC3	<p>Focus is on EC3</p> <p><i>1: the first sentence of Policy EC2 should seek that the “area of Crannaford be regenerated through refurbishment”, but that references to “selective development” and “new development” should be deleted from that sentence and in the second sentence of the policy;</i></p> <p>This is a similar suggestion raised by EDDC.</p> <p>2. Class uses and 6. Town centre uses</p>	<p>This site has a lot of dead space and an element of new development on site will help with full regeneration of the old retail site. EDDC said they were happy to get rid of the term “selective” and to just use the term development</p> <p>Happy for examiner to look at the class uses of this site</p>

	<p><i>3.revert to wording in para 4 of the Reg 14 version of the policy requiring that any proposals for the site must demonstrate that “the volume of traffic generated by the proposals can be accommodated on the local highway network without detriment to rail and road safety including quiet lanes...”.</i></p> <p><i>4: in addition to point 3 above, the policy should be amended to require that require that any additional traffic should not materially increase the traffic generated above that arising from the existing permitted development i.e. historic traffic levels associated with use of the site.</i></p> <p><i>7: the inclusion of a requirement that all proposals for the site should include a Travel Plan.</i></p> <p>5: removal of the discussion in para 7 of page 91 in relation to potential crossing improvements when no evidence demonstrates the need for such improvements.</p>	<p>throughout the site process (See details right from Call for Land, and Appendix 18, 19, 7 and to consider whether to utilise the use of “rural” retail so that this site does not compromise “town centre” retail provision.</p> <p>Happy for wording on traffic impacts to be adjusted by the examiner.</p> <p>Difficult to prove or require that volume of traffic should not materially increase the traffic generated above that arising from existing/ historic traffic levels associated with use of the site. This is because the site has had several uses since the Country suppliers retail business moved out, and the traffic data available is from crossing the railway and not in and out of the Site. Traffic levels actually fell after the retail site was closed so existing movements are not indicative of the capacity of this site.</p> <p>Happy for examiner to make a decision on the need for Travel Plan and or Transport Assessment.</p> <p>SG put this paragraph in, as it was important to state that the Site EC3 as a single site was not likely to trigger the level of need for railway improvements, and that this</p>
--	---	--

		<p>site needs to be judged in context and proportional to everything else that is going on locally.</p> <p>It is interesting to note that the developers of Cranbrook town (HLM) want this paragraph removed as they do not feel there is a need for “<i>potential crossing improvements when no evidence demonstrates the need for such improvements</i>”</p>
Devon County Council		No response required
G & S Hancock		No response required. Note that the classes should be updated to the 2020 legislation.
National Trust	<p>CF1 The proposals for development and land use as set out in policy CFS1, would therefore require the agreement of both the lessee and the landlord, and would also be subject to legal requirements set out under the Charities Act 2011. It is not known whether any discussions have taken place between the current occupier of the site and the Broadclyst Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group. Process.</p> <p>EC1</p> <p>NE3 tree replacement policy.</p> <p><i>it may not always be appropriate to replace such trees as required in Policy NE1 (and NE3) of the Neighbourhood Plan, which states where one or more trees would be removed, it shall be replaced with up to three new trees.</i></p>	<p>The land is currently occupied by Clyst Vale Community College on a long lease. The school were members of the Sports facility working group and are fully engaged in the process and development of the facility. The school Governors have kept parents informed throughout the development stages.</p> <p>Agree with the proposed amendment</p> <p>The National Trust demonstrate their tree planting credentials nationally, which we wholeheartedly applaud. As such, they should not struggle to meet the local requirements of policy NE1/3. We do not see any reason to provide them with</p>

	<p>General comments</p>	<p>an exemption. We are keen to promote tree planting within our Parish rather than nationally and they are the biggest landowner.</p> <p>The Parish Council will need to work with some of these comments in their future work</p>
<p>12.Network Rail</p>	<p>Site EC3 Typo provided</p> <p>Comparison between Crannaford and Pinhoe made.</p> <p>A 9 day camera census taken in April 2021 by Tracsis shows that an average of 1,200 vehicles and 2,300 pedestrians are using the crossing daily. We currently have a camera at the crossing and it is corroborating its heavy usage; this is far more than ever intended for what was a quiet, rural backroad.</p> <p>We cannot accept any increase in traffic over this crossing without mitigation. An upgraded to full protection should be provided before any further developments are made.</p>	<p>agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Further data was provided by NR. A request by EDDC was made for confirmation as to which crossing this data is for.</p> <p>This data is in stark contrast to those provided in the reg 14 response (Cannaford level crossing: <i>The usage of the crossing has increased from 89 vehicles to 378 per day</i>) are to be questioned and checked. Broadclyst survey recorded 322 vehicles per day. 1200 is a 272.67% increase of 322. If the new data is for Crannaford crossing , it would mean that half the population of Cranbrook town will be walking across this crossing daily which only leads to a rural area with no facilities. The data provided in Appendix 7 by Network Rail shows levels of 2079 vehicles and 332 pedestrians at Pinhoe and the data provided is more likely to be for Pinhoe.</p> <p>DISAGREE. The site has had past and existing access use levels and a regeneration of</p>

	<p>It is not clear from Figure 35 where the access for this site is but it looks to be very close to the level crossing. Our experience is that where there is an access which might be restricted (single track) and so close to a level crossing blocking back might occur. Blocking back is a situation where road vehicles enter a level crossing when they are unable to leave because the exit is blocked by other vehicles, so vehicles are stationary on the level crossing. This is a very dangerous situation and consideration of this should be given.</p>	<p>this site is unlikely to increase access of a level that will trigger the need for the level of mitigation being demanded by Network Rail. In the Reg 16 response by David Lock on Behalf of HLM Taylor Wimpey Persimmon Homes - EC3 who are building out Cranbrook Town. Mitigation should be proportionate to a site and based on whether the site regeneration increase will have a severe impact on the safe and efficient operation of the road and rail infrastructure.</p> <p>The site is served by a long driveway, with a good splay, and no issues have been raised by DCC highways.</p>
Richard Holman	Validity of HNS Email additional response	<p>The call for Sites and drafting of housing policies used the HNS data and if the Plan had been accepted at the first submission the HNS would have still been valid. EDDC has just released in Sept Housing Monitoring update to year ending 31 March 2022.</p>
Richard Holman	Reg 16 response	<p>The SG are happy for the Examiner to deal with this response. The Group feel that the NP has been prepared within its legislative framework and that the Call for sites and site selection process is legally robust as advised by Tozers solicitors.</p> <p>This response shows a misunderstanding of the role</p>

		<p>NP and especially in relation to: provision of infrastructure, and the difference between NP consultations and a referendum.</p> <p>Further contextual information below</p>
<p>Richard Holman owns a field and yard at the Western end of the Lodge trading estate. This estate is isolated from both Broadclyst Station (via a busy and potentially dangerous road bridge with no pedestrian route) and Broadclyst Village (linked via Station Road). Station Road is a particularly dangerous road, as it has no footpath and carries much traffic. Devon County Council acknowledge this and offer free transport to and from school for children who need to use Station Road to reach their school.</p> <p>These significant constraints mean that as a stand alone site, mixed use delivery is almost certainly unviable. However, when looked at as a whole (the field owned by the Holman's plus the two haulage yards to the West of the site), it is likely that the layout, type, and tenure could be made viable.</p> <p>There were also challenges around whether the site met sustainability tests; the pedestrian infrastructure was largely reliant on a connection over the railway and to Cranbrook Town Centre. What the site was not able to do was secure this crossing, and so there remained concerns around developing in an unsustainable location, with a reliance on the private car.</p> <p>On this basis, the whole estate was put out for public consultation at Reg 14 as a potential housing site. Although residents saw merit in the site's haulage uses ceasing operation and the site being used for housing, there were no assurances that development would take place across the entire site, with the end result being that the haulage use would continue. The public vote did not support development on this site, mainly due to traffic impact but some concerns around flood risk. Furthermore, although the Holman site offered land for a pedestrian bridge, it did not offer any funding towards the potential £3m cost of a bridge.</p>		
<p>21.Savills on behalf of FWS Carter and Sons</p>	<p>DC5 We support the flexible wording of this draft policy which supports low carbon District Heating Schemes and/or alternative low-carbon schemes. Indeed, with the fast pace of technological change in this area, flexibility is imperative and it is important that this is reflected in the wording of this policy as opposed to any requirement for new development to connect to District Heat Networks. The alternative could have significant impacts on the viability and deliverability of new development and may cause the NDP to undermine the deliverability of strategic policies for the area.</p> <p>Recommendation Retain the policy text to not require District Heat Network connections for new development in the Parish.</p> <p>DC6: Recommendation Amend the policy text to remove the wording that has been struck-through:</p>	<p>In this policy specification goes beyond Local district Heating schemes, so flexibility is provided in the policy. No change required.</p> <p>As acknowledged, there are 2 existing solar farms in the Parish but it was <u>not noted</u></p>

	<p>Micro hydroelectricity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solar farm (up to 5 hectares and where the community directly benefit.) • Ground Source and Air Source Heating.” <p>ET2 Recommendation Amend the policy text to remove the wording that has been struck-through: “Proposals for Class C1 will not be supported.” “up to a maximum of 2 storeys,”</p> <p>#4 Recommendation Delete draft policy H4 from the NDP.</p> <p>T1 and T4</p>	<p>by Carter/ Savills that neither of these benefit/s the local community. The size requirement could be adjusted so that there is some flexibility here, but not willing to take out clause where the community directly benefit. Title of this Policy is: Community Led renewable energy production and that needs to remain the key behind all these policy developments.</p> <p>Not supported by the SG as emphasis of tourism development was to support internally (local) based and focused development and to restrict commercial scale developments. This policy will spread small scale commercial development across the parish and across the community. There is already a C1 application at the Science Park, which the PC supported. The 2 storey limit is designed to keep new development across the rural parish as low impact as possible. This is also in keeping with other buildings within the Parish which are predominantly single or 2 storey.</p> <p>Definitely not supported by the SG, this policy only applies to 3 sites in the NP and all landowners and viability support this policy.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Recommendation Include the Kerswell Barton site as an allocation for development within the NDP.</p> <p>NE5Recommendation Remove the requirement for a 10% biodiversity net gain from the draft policy. Page</p>	<p>No. In this policy there are as no specific sites listed in T4 and T1.</p> <p>No EDDC accepted the 10% level and this is in line with National requirements and EDDC emerging LP is recommending an increased % level of which there is support for. The natural environment and an increase in biodiversity is an important aim of our NP.</p>
--	--	--