

Pre-submission (Regulation 14) Neighbourhood Plan Response Record

This table sets out all consultation received from the Regulation 14 consultation, anonymised respondents numbers where respondents are individuals, the Steering Group and Parish Council response to the comments and how the Plan changes, or not, as a result. 8 individual responses were received and 11 from other (including statutory) consultees.

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
1	Page 65/66 8.15	I can't see any mention of reforming and repairing footpaths. We, in wheelchairs and scooters cannot even get to the shops because of the state of them. Also you block paths with barrier gates. I know they are intended to stop traffic, but we in scooters for the disabled cannot get through either. Please consider us.	Highways Issue. The Parish Council will check measurements of barrier gates with Highways.	None
2		<p>We have both read the Consultation Summary Leaflet and the on-line Draft Neighbourhood Plan and would wish to comment as follows.</p> <p>We agree with the decision to commence the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan for our village. Cannington is first and foremost a Rural Village but is facing numerous challenges including significant new housing growth, through traffic and difficulties of parking.</p> <p>Most importantly for us and our neighbours is the need to protect the distinct appearance and local identity of Cannington, along with the unspoilt countryside which surrounds this rural settlement and forms such important approaches to the village.</p> <p>We attended consultation days at the village hall and were most pleased to hear that virtually everyone present were of the same mind and were making the same comments.</p> <p>We and our neighbours appreciated the opportunity to be consulted.</p> <p>The draft Neighbourhood Plan on line reflects these views which we and others expressed consequently we are happy to <u>FULLY SUPPORT</u> the current Draft Neighbourhood Plan and the policies and guidance therein.</p> <p>We have only comment</p>	Comments noted. No action required.	None
	Page 32 6.17	A couple of days ago, on 30 th April 2021, detailed planning permission was granted for 73 houses on land adjacent to the Grange, at the southern end of the village.		

¹ verbatim, not interpreted

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
		<p>We are aware that the Parish Council supported this as an ideal location for substantial new residential growth and felt that it would make a significant contribution to providing new homes to accord with the village's designation as Tier Two settlement.</p> <p>No doubt there will be some pleasure with villagers, the Parish Council and the District Council that this suitable and non-controversial site will shortly be coming to fruition.</p> <p>This planning approval is significant in that it halves the required housing supply for the Parish. It also reflects the logic of siting significant growth on the southern side of the village, in close proximity to the A39 and bypass, so as not to further exacerbate the difficulties of additional traffic through the village. From this location, traffic can easily progress towards the Principal Town of Bridgwater and the nearby junctions with the M5 for purposes of work and to access all essential major facilities and services. It is a good decision.</p> <p>May we simply suggest that the Draft Plan and quickly updated to include this most recently approved housing commitment and Material Consideration, as it progresses to the next stage in its consideration</p>	Amend outline to full and change application to 13/20/00026	Amend outline to full and change application to 13/20/00026
3		<p>A lot of good work been completed in assembling an enormous amount of data. This is to be commended.</p> <p>My comments are as follows:</p>		
		The base report is compiled of some 88 pages and was initially hard to find on the web. I also feel 88 pages is excessive and most people will not read it.	The Plan was summarised in a short and accessible leaflet for those who did not or could not read the whole Plan.	None
		I found it hard to find ' <i>the Plan</i> ' as it was hidden around page 82.		
		I do appreciate it is difficult to improve what we already have		
		My belief is that a clearer strategy is required, highlighting the major issues and requirements of the VILLAGE, then followed by a succinct plan showing how the strategy may/will be implemented.		
		I would also suggest you compile an Executive Strategy which must be placed at the beginning of your document, highlighting the <i>key issues</i> of your findings. E.g., Car parking, recreation facilities, visitor attractions etc. (two pages is adequate and will then be read by most)	Insert a list of all policies, hyperlink and their page number on contents page.	Amend accordingly.

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
		I would also suggest the report be kept to 20 pages maximum, enabling most people to indulge in the whole report.	The Plan was summarised in a short and accessible leaflet for those who did not or could not read the whole Plan.	None
		Have you contacted other Parish Councils, who have had success in creating and implementing a plan, and take advice?	Other Plans were looked at, and we sought professional planning advice from consultants and SDC during the process.	None
		Furthermore, is there anyone out there who could offer some innovating and dynamic ideas? I am sure there are specialists with proven pedigrees that would help. It would require a clear scope of work and may cost some money!	See above. And there would be an additional cost to get the document designed in a bespoke way.	None
		E.g., How could we utilise the playing field at the north end of the village?	Future PC consideration	
		Local businesses need to become involved.	Surveys took place and the results are on the website	None
		Creation of a regular farmers market would bring in people. Likewise, a European type market would again bring people into the village. Temporary road closures would enable these markets to trade within the village for a morning. Local shopkeepers would also gain from this action	PC always open to ideas, although not something the PC would initiate. Roads are difficult to temporarily close given that they are through routes and buses etc would need diverting away from the village centre.	None

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
		Appendices One and Two are found at the end of the report. What are they for?	They are part of the Plan and the appendices say what they are.	None
		Your contents page needs managing as currently it is indicating section 10 is on page 754!	Comment noted.	Amendment to be made to correct typo.
4		Lack of parking facilities caused Cannington Bridge Club to move to Wembdon	We are aware of parking issues with use of the village hall but there is no capacity to change this close to the hall.	None
5	P10 Table 1	The details provided have been sourced from the 2011 census. Can the information provided be updated from this year's census?	The results of the 2021 census will not be published by ONS until 2023. The mid-year 2019 population estimates are available now, however, and we can update data for population.	Amend text accordingly.
	P26 4.3	Does the proposed residential housing development on land off Oak Tree Way support the delivery of new housing for Cannington as a Tier 2 settlement?	We understand that it over-subscribes the Local Plan minimum.	None
	P29 Table 2 & 3	Data provided, particularly in Tables 2 & 3 are sourced from the 2011 census. Can the information provided be updated from this year's census?	The results of the 2021 census will not be published by ONS until 2023. The mid-year 2019 population estimates are available now, however, and we can update data for population.	Amend text accordingly.
	P31/2 6.1-3	What is the total number of new dwellings that have been constructed or given planning over and above the 73 dwellings on Land to the North of Grange Farm?	There are further details on housing numbers on the NP website.	Add link to NP website, Facts & Figures page to footnote.

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
	P85 COM01 ii)	Volume of traffic along Main Road increases considerably early morning and early evening when additional traffic presumably travelling to and from Hinkley Point Power Station, possibly including that associated with the new construction project. Although some may use the local amenities many may be driving through the village rather than using the by-pass roads. The recent traffic speed calming scheme has resulted in a single width restriction. If the proposed development off Oak Tree Way goes ahead then during the construction phase and upon completion considerably more traffic will be turning off the Main Road along Brownings Road to access Oak Tree Way, which is the only access point to the proposed new dwellings	The PC objected to the planning application.	None
	P85 COM01 vii)	The improvement of the broadband infrastructure would be most welcome, particularly if the mobile phone signal can be improved.	Comments noted.	None
6	DEV01	Any new development needs to be in keeping with the rest of the village to ensure the character of the village is retained, so whilst development should occur it should not be at the detriment of the rest of the village and its residents. Planning should take into account not just the individual applications but the cumulative impact of all planning applications to have a better understanding of the impact. The character and boundary of the village should be retained for future generations as once they have been lost they can never be regained.	Each planning application has to be taken on its own merits. It is noted that the respondent seems to be agreeing with the policy on which the comments are based.	None
	DEV02	Cannington has a defined village boundary that should be retained and the new bypass should not be used to redefine the village boundary. The benefits to the village outweigh any benefits to development and it is critical to retain this to keep the character of the village. The current buffer to the bypass retains the hedgerows, habitat and areas of visual importance identified in figures 13 and 14. The village lost a lot of hedgerows, habitat with the bypass and that makes it more crucial to retain now. There is sufficient land identified within the designated boundary to meet future needs.	Agreed.	None.
	DEV03	Whilst there is a requirement for affordable housing there is a need to ensure higher priority groups identified are prioritised as recent influx to the village has increased prices to buy and rent	Agreed	None.
	ENV01	There is nothing more important to the village and its residents than the landscape and habitat and we should protect this for future generations to	Agreed	None.

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
		enjoy. Once these have been taken away, we can never get them back and they need to be protected rigorously. The landscape features and views are what make the village so appealing and those recognised in figures 13 and 14 should be retained for the future. The approach to the village give the village its appeal and character and make the residents proud to be living here. Lose these and we will lose the nature of the village		
	ENV02	The policy to make all development of high quality not only help to compliment the character of the village and should be the minimum standards expected. Reducing the impact of parking and giving families gardens are vital to the health and well-being of current and future residents. We need to build health and well-being into the village to make life and the village sustainable.	Agreed	None.
	ENV03	Village amenities and facilities should never be compromised. Recent influx of short-term residents show the need for facilities that support the residents and that the heart of the village needs to be kept strong. The facilities have allowed the village to continue as normal as possible in current times and are precious and footpaths, open spaces and buildings for community use helping all residents.	Agreed	None.
	TRANS01	Development around the village, especially HPC have had a dramatic impact on the village and the residents. The roads have become shortcuts with vehicles wanting to beat others that have used the bypass. Currently the measures in place are ineffective and need to be evaluated. The parking around the shop, pub and take-away frequently completely block the pavement, road and pedestrian crossing. Even HGVs delivering to the shop obstruct the pedestrian crossing and the clear areas on the approach to the danger of pedestrians. This has never been addressed and even if they were addressed at the planning phase they were either inadequate or are being ignored. The parking is limited and any development or business needs to clearly demonstrate they have addressed the issues on building.	Review of phase 1 traffic calming to take place. Feasibility Study for phase 2 College car park available evenings and weekends	None
	ECON01	Where possible any change of use should be a last resort and employment opportunities should be retained.	This is what the policy is seeking to do but it has limitations set by the Government in national	None

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
			policy with permitted development rights having been extended and flexibility to change of use being required.	
	EDU01	Where educational establishments should be supported, they need to work with the residents and become inclusive in the community. There should be work done to limit signage that blights the village and also work done to retain access to areas that have been used by the community for decades not locked shut. The traffic and parking caused by the current premises should be addressed before any future building work is agreed to. There is a need to work in collaboration with the community not exclude them.	Good liaison with PC and School and College. Issues of safeguarding in relation to the College allowing public access through the site. There is parking on site.	None
	COM01	Broadband speed in the village needs to be addressed to support residents and businesses alike, currently working in the village is very difficult at current broadband speeds. Parking in the village as a result of the college and HPC causes issues for residents and more parking areas need to be considered. The parking around the shop, pub and take-away clearly demonstrate that current policy is failing the residents and putting them in danger so I cannot see how future plans that do not clearly address the issues need to be addressed. The village lacks indoor and outdoor community exercise facilities and the college gym is not accessible at suitable times to be a viable option. This needs to be addressed in future considerations.	Part of Connecting Devon and Somerset Long term – if a new community hall is wanted. Could be considered as part of the review of the Neighbourhood Plan in the future.	None
7	Page 19 Page 54 7.12	Building for a healthy life. Park & Ride and field behind Denman's Farm. This land inside the ring road needs to I feel allocated for housing. It has a natural access to the new bypass with a left-hand turn towards Bridgwater which could be managed by traffic lights. Land already served by infrastructure and should avoid harm to the existing environment assets of the area. With space for a New Community Hall, Community Woodland similar to the Millennium	New community hall not previously supported as a priority	

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
		<p>Wood in Nether Stowey at the south of their playing field and a Habitat creation similar to the Stogumber wildflower field and Insect hotel area at Steart Wetland Wildfowl Trust. The Park & Ride makes a ready-made car park for a New Cannington Community Hall. With reference to the recent planning application by Gladmans; they incorporated land for a new Community Hall in their design, which I understand from my records that the present owner's father who was a Parish Councillor some 40 years wished for some of his land to be used for the benefit of the village for example a New Community Hall. This land can be built with sustainable housing.</p> <p>References: see please</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents 'Homes for People and Wildlife' produced by The Wildlife Trusts and 11 other charities. • (Plantlife, Buglife, Butterfly Conservation, Bat Conservation Trust, Bumblebee Conservation Trust, Woodland Trust) on 11th January 2018 giving recommendations and guidance for building housing in a nature friendly way. For the health and well-being of residents. • The Governments' National Pollination Strategy 204 • Landscape & Ecology Management Plans (LEMPS) local pollination action plans with large residential developments. • Bees Needs 4.1 Page 12 • Plantlife Charity Encouragement of flower species in public open spaces • Somerset County Council;- Net Zero carbon emissions by 2030 (9 years from date of this letter) 	<p>At present to return to a greenfield site.</p> <p>Proposed development doesn't meet Highway's approval – currently under appeal.</p> <p>The NHP doesn't allocate sites</p>	
	Page 23 3.4	Somerset's Climate Emergency Strategy (A material consideration to be taken into account when considering planning applications)	Comment noted.	None
	Page 41	Priority Habitat Inventory England (Deciduous Woodland) Wood pasture and parkland. A biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) review needs to be done for our area.	While the PC would like to be able to do this it doesn't have the funding to produce a BAP for the Parish.	None
	Page 49 & 55	'Court House' near Cannington Walled Garden to be specifically added as an Important Listed Building and Local Heritage Asset. To put on Sedgemoor	Court House is already listed. It is in Bridgwater	None

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
		<p>District Council or new name for the area district council 'Local List' if not already on it. It is a possible village facility and essential amenity for the benefit of all and benefit the majority of the community of all ages and backgrounds and it has easy access. Particularly as stated at the Cannington Parish Council meeting that I attended on Tuesday 13th July 2021 it was noted that the current owners have run out of money and will only maintain it for safety reasons. This building is in the centre of the village and could be the alternative Community Hall using a 'brownfield' site. It already has parking that would have more spaces available in the evenings. Make the garden our 'Village Green' open to everyone. A feasibility study could identify that what was Cliffords Hall could have the floor made into a dance floor. There are rooms for council offices; the rest can be rented out as Small Business Hubs creating further employment in the village and rent to the owners for further accommodation. Make the Café/restaurant open to the public – a further Tourist attraction to complement our pubs, and Walled Garden. This could be leased to an entrepreneur/business person/franchise eg National Trust.</p>	<p>and Taunton College Trust ownership.</p> <p>Cannington Court is also a listed building. It is currently leased to EDF in relation to the Hinkley Point C development.</p>	
	Page 55	<p>Our existing Village Hall is 100 years old and not 'fit for purpose'. There is no parking whatsoever. The pavement is narrow and unsafe near the through road and there are no facilities for loading/unloading. The downstairs room was the 'Old Working Mens' Club' and has a low ceiling and was used at one time as a skittle alley. There are no views from the windows.</p> <p>At the time of writing the parish has £92,000 in the general fund £167,000 in the Leisure fund</p> <p>Plus, the sale of the old village hall could sell for about £1m, plus 25% Community Infrastructure Levy from each new dwelling built (which Cannington needs to secure from Sedgemoor District Council or the new named council in the future, this amount is only valid with a Neighbourhood Plan in place.</p> <p>Plus we the rent from the Playing Field car park which is £1,200 each month that could be saved towards a new Community Hall before it stops being rented.</p>	<p>Disagree with the comment made. The Village Hall has been refurbished and is well-used by local clubs and individuals.</p> <p>Unsubstantiated value. Would planning be approved and for what?</p>	None.

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
		<p>All this money needs to be 'ring fenced' for spending only on the New Community Hall. With the old village hall sold for estimate £1,000,000 and a ring-fenced figure from our general fund and Leisure fund of £200,000 and an annual income of £13,400 saved from the Park and Ride. The village has £1,213,400 available. If built from scratch for reference see Holford, Cossington, Stogursey.</p> <p>So a New Community Hall is possible on either Denmans Field near the Park & Ride or 'Court House' next to the Walled Gardens.</p>	<p>The funds generated are used to keep the precept low.</p> <p>Leisure fund – community has agreed how to spend it. Rules for general fund.</p>	
		<p>I feel the Neighbourhood Plan certainly addresses what we have now. But I feel as a parish more needs to be done to create new special places in the village will require protection in the future</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More community parkland. See area of Taunton community initiative 'The Wellsprings Greenspace' • Huge street planting campaign. We still have at time of writing some funds left from the £20,000 reserved for trees. • Woodland walk similar to the Millennium Wood at the south end of Nether Stowey's playing field. • Creative woodland space for primary age children. Our primary school has some land and this would require funding or/and grants. • Sports & Leisure. We already have fantastic facilities at our Playing Field on the north of the village and the land yet to be utilised and its use decided upon by the people of Cannington • Arts & Crafts. One of our local businesses could share resources to make a 'dedicated' creative space for the community <p>I suggest Cannington Parish Council put out a search for a group of Community Leaders; individuals who have initiative, and ideas and skills and are trainers and motivators, supported and encouraged by the Parish Council to drive ideas forward regarding the above list.</p>	<p>Only available land at playing fields – future use yet to be decided.</p> <p>Capital projects team looking at tree planting Responsibility of school/SCC. Open day to be planned.</p>	None.

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
	Consultation summary leaflet reference 3	To keep our entrances green and inviting. Our two roundabouts to have their trees and shrubs protected as existing wildlife habitats and our new north roundabout maintained as wildflowers.	Disagree – not good first impression of the village. Comment in relation to the North roundabout agreed and the PC is discussing opportunities to take control of its management from Highways Authority.	None
8		No mention of brownies, scouts or army cadets	To be addressed para 2.25. We will add reference to various groups and organisations.	Amend accordingly.
9 – Bridgwater and Taunton College		On behalf of the college, I am noting our support and agreement with the CPC's plan, its vision and overarching objectives. As ever, if we were to plan any future developments across the Cannington campus that related to any aspects of these objectives then we would do so in full consultation.	Comments noted.	None
10 – National Grid		National Grid has appointed Avison Young to review and respond to Neighbourhood Plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regard to the current consultation on the above document. About National Grid National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (NGET) owns and maintains the electricity transmission system in England and Wales. The energy is then distributed to the electricity distribution network operators, so it can reach homes and businesses. National Grid Gas plc (NGG) owns and operates the high-pressure gas transmission system across the UK. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the UK's four gas distribution networks where pressure is reduced for public use.	Comments noted.	None

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
		<p>National Grid Ventures (NGV) is separate from National Grid's core regulated businesses. NGV develop, operate and invest in energy projects, technologies, and partnerships to help accelerate the development of a clean energy future for consumers across the UK, Europe and the United States.</p> <p>Proposed development sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets:</p> <p>Following a review of the above document we have identified the following National Grid assets as falling within the Neighbourhood area boundary</p> <p>Electricity Transmission</p> <p>Asset Description</p> <p>VQ ROUTE: 275Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: BRIDGEWATER - HINKLEY POINT 1</p> <p>ZZ ROUTE TWR (004 - 082): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: HINKLEY POINT - TAUNTON 1</p> <p>A plan showing details of National Grid's assets is attached to this letter. Please note that this plan is illustrative only.</p> <p>National Grid also provides information in relation to its assets at the website below.</p> <p>www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shapefiles/</p> <p>Please see attached information outlining guidance on development close to National Grid infrastructure.</p> <p>Distribution Networks</p> <p>Information regarding the electricity distribution network is available at the website below:</p> <p>www.energynetworks.org.uk</p> <p>Information regarding the gas distribution network is available by contacting: plantprotection@cadentgas.com</p> <p>Further Advice</p> <p>Please remember to consult National Grid on any Neighbourhood Plan Documents or site-specific proposals that could affect our assets.</p> <p>We would be grateful if you could add our details shown below to your consultation database, if they are not already included:</p>		

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
		<p>Matt Verlander, nationalgrid.uk@avisonyoung.com Avison Young, Central Square, South Orchard Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 3AZ Director Spencer Jefferies, Town Planner box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com National Grid, National Grid House, Warwick Technology Park, Gallows Hill, Warwick, CV34 6DA If you require any further information in respect of this letter, then please contact us. See also Appendix CPC01</p>		
11- Gladman		<p>INTRODUCTION Context These representations provide Gladman’s response to the Cannington Neighbourhood Plan (CNP) under Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Plan (General) Regulations 2012. Gladman Developments Ltd specialise in the promotion of strategic land for residential development and associated community infrastructure and have considerable experience in contributing to the Development Plan preparation process having made representations on numerous planning documents throughout the UK alongside participating in many Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan examinations. Through these representations, Gladman provides an analysis of the FNP and the policy choices promoted within the draft Plan. Comments made by Gladman through these representations are provided in consideration of the DMNP’s suite of policies and its ability to fulfil the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions as established by paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and supported by the Neighbourhood Plan chapter of the PPG</p>	<p>Introductory comments noted (as is the copy and paste approach with two other different “NPs” referred to!). The Cannington Neighbourhood Plan has followed due process and takes fully into account national policy. The wording of the NPPF is critical in this respect. There is no requirement that the content of Neighbourhood Plans “must” contain any policies in particular. We have taken into account the issues and considerations that the NPPF raises, throughout its various chapters,</p>	None
		<p>LEGAL REQUIREMENTS, NATIONAL POLICY & GUIDANCE Legal Requirements Before a neighbourhood plan can proceed to referendum it must be tested against a set of basic conditions set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4b of</p>		None

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
		<p>the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The basic conditions that the CNP must meet are as follows:</p> <p>“(a) Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the order.</p> <p>(d) The making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.</p> <p>(e) The making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area).</p> <p>(f) The making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations.</p> <p>(g) Prescribed conditions are met in relation to the Order (or plan) and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the order (or neighbourhood plan).”</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. In doing so it sets out the requirements for the preparation of neighbourhood plans to be in conformity with the strategic priorities for the wider area and the role they play in delivering sustainable development to meet development needs.</p> <p>At the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread through plan-making and decision-taking. This means that plan makers should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and Local Plans should meet objectively assessed Cannington Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation 4 housing needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change. This requirement is applicable to neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>The recent Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) updates make clear that neighbourhood plans should conform to national policy requirements and take account of the most up-to-date evidence. This is so that Cannington Parish Council can assist Sedgemoor District Council (SDC) in delivering sustainable development and be in accordance with basic condition (d).</p>	<p>through consultation and our evidence base. It is careful to use wording such as “should” and “consider”. We have followed this advice as we have developed the Plan.</p> <p>Reference to the White Paper is noted, but this is already out of date with the Planning Bill now moving through Parliament, subsummation with the Levelling-Up Bill being mentioned in the press since the change of Secretary of State in Autumn 2021. Many of the proposals (as the respondent will know) set out in the White Paper are still being debated, and some have already been dropped.</p> <p>We are fully aware of the Basic Conditions and have ensured that the Local Planning Authority has been informed and</p>	

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
		<p>The application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development will have implications for how communities engage with neighbourhood planning. Paragraph 13 of the Framework makes clear that Qualifying Bodies preparing neighbourhood plans should develop plans that support strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing development and plan positively to support local development.</p> <p>Paragraph 15 further makes clear that neighbourhood plans should set out a succinct and positive vision for the future of the area. A neighbourhood plan should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency. Neighbourhood plans should seek to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, jobs and thriving local places that the country needs, whilst responding positively to the wider opportunities for growth.</p> <p>Paragraph 29 of the Framework makes clear that a neighbourhood plan must be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider area and plan positively to support the delivery of sustainable growth opportunities.</p> <p>Planning for the Future White Paper</p> <p>On 6th August 2020, Government published the Planning for the Future White Paper setting out proposals for how it is seeking to ‘radically reform’ the planning system. The proposals are seeking to streamline and modernise the planning process.</p> <p>The White Paper Consultation closed on 29th October 2020 and it is important the Parish Council keeps abreast with the proposals and implications this may in turn have on the preparation of the CNP. Timescales remain uncertain however subject to the outcomes of this process the Government has signalled its intent to make rapid progress toward this new planning system through the swift introduction of new legislation to implement the changes.</p> <p>The Parish Council should be mindful of these changes and the potential impact to the CNP and the need to undertake a review of the neighbourhood plan following the Plan’s adoption. Further details on this matter are set out in section 3 of these representations</p>	<p>contributed to the development of the Plan and its policies. This continues, with SDC’s response to Regulation 14 consultation.</p> <p>We are, therefore, “mindful” of potential changes to the planning system, but that is as far as it goes in relation to the evolving planning system, with no significant change to the NP process yet determined through statute or the NPPF which would affect the Regulation 14 version of the Plan.</p>	

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
		<p>RELATIONSHIP TO LOCAL PLANS</p> <p>Adopted Development Plan</p> <p>To meet the requirements of the Framework and the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions, neighbourhood plans should be prepared to conform to the strategic policy requirements set out in the adopted Development Plan.</p> <p>The adopted Development Plan relevant to the preparation of the CNP and the Development Plan which the CNP will be tested against is the Sedgemoor Local Plan 2011-2032. The Plan was adopted in February 2019 and is the overarching planning policy document for the District and forms the basis for decision making process in relation to all planning applications looking forward to 2032, or such a time as it, or elements of it are superseded</p>		
		<p>CANNINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN</p> <p>Context These representations are made in response to the current consultation on the draft version of the CNP, under Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. This chapter of our representation highlights the key points which Gladman raises with regard to the content of the CNP as currently drafted.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plan Policies</p> <p>This section of the representations provides Gladman's comments on the draft CNP policies. As currently proposed, Gladman believe that a couple of the CNP policies require further modification/amendment, before they can be considered consistent with the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Condition</p>		
	DEV02	<p>POLICY DEV02: DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS ON THE EDGE OF THE SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY</p> <p>The CNP supports development but does not seek to allocate specific sites for development, rather the CNP sets criteria-based policies to help determine whether proposals which come forward are appropriate. Policy DEV02 sets out the structured criteria which must be met by proposals outside the settlement boundary before they are deemed appropriate.</p> <p>Gladman acknowledge the positive stance taken by the CNP and Policy DEV02 in its likeness to SDC Local Plan Policy T2a. SDC Local Plan Policy T2a is a positive policy approach to growth outside settlement boundaries of Tier 2 settlements, which requires Cannington to deliver a minimum of 150</p>	The respondent will be aware of the PC's position on their proposal, currently going through the appeal process. The PC's objection to the proposal is clear and in the public domain.	None

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
		<p>dwelling as per table 5.1. This is the minimum figure and until sites have been approved which meet at least the minimum levels of growth detailed in table 5.1, Policy T2a includes an interim approach that supports proposals outside the settlement boundary, provided certain criteria are met.</p> <p>It is understood that a total of 89 dwellings have already been delivered under Policy T2a and there is therefore a minimum residual requirement of 61 dwellings required to meet the minimum growth levels outlined in table 5.1 of Policy T2a. The interim approach set out in Policy T2a to allow the release of sites therefore remains relevant. It is understood that proposals which exceed the minimum level of growth as per table 5.1 are required to demonstrate there would be no significant adverse impacts caused by exceeded the minimum housing requirement set by the SDLP.</p> <p>CNP Policy DEV02 is very similar to SDC Local Plan Policy T2a with similar criteria but provides more detail in some instances, such as placing a restriction on suitable building heights. Gladman believe that this level of detail is not necessary and that each site should be assessed independently on its own merits.</p> <p>To illustrate this point, Gladman suggest that the wording used mirrors that of SDC Local Plan Policy T2a which states:</p> <p>“The scale of development should be appropriate to the size, accessibility, character and physical identity of the settlement”</p> <p>Gladman are supportive of the positive stance taken by Policy DEV02 in line with SDC Local Plan Policy T2a on development bordering the settlement boundary. It should however be noted that SDC Local Plan Policy T2a has been part of the development plan since adoption in February 2019 and is still an up-to-date policy effective in delivering new housing. Due to CNP Policy DEV02 similarity with SDC Local Plan Policy T2a it is in conformity with the Local Plan and doesn't need to reiterate/replicate a Policy which is already in adopted policy.</p>	<p>73 Grange Meadows 16 Otters Brook</p> <p>The PC strongly disagrees with the suggested amendment to policy. SDC recently agreed amendment to application 13/20/00026 for example, to exclude 2.5 storey buildings from the development. This principle should extend to other proposals.</p> <p>The NP is the appropriate place to reference details</p>	

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
			such as this. The NPPF, National Design Guide and Code elevate and emphasise the importance of design in the planning process, particularly at the local level.	
	DEV03	<p>POLICY DEV03: LOCAL LETTINGS OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING</p> <p>CNP Policy DEV03 outlines the desire for and new affordable housing units delivered in the Neighbourhood Plan Area to be give initial priority to eligible households from the Cannington Neighbourhood Plan Area.</p> <p>Gladman are supportive of CNP Policy DEV03 and understand the importance of affordable housing being available to local people</p>	Comments noted.	None
	Site submission	<p>SITE SUBMISSION</p> <p>Land off Oak Tree Way, Cannington</p> <p>Gladman is a privately funded, family run business with over 30 years' experience I the land and development industry. From our beginnings in housebuilding, through to our success in commercial and industrial properties, we have evolved into the UK's largest and most successful land promoter.</p> <p>Whilst at this stage CNP is not seeking to allocate specific site for development, it is worthwhile noting any sites that are currently being considered by Sedgemoor District Council for development. Gladman is currently promoting Land off Oak Tree Way, Cannington for residential development. A planning application (ref: 13/19/00043) made my Gladman for 160 dwellings, of which 48 will be affordable homes, a riverside walk, children's play area and community orchard is currently the subject of a planning appeal. The illustrative development framework plan can be seen at Appendix 1.</p> <p>The 10.82 Ha site offers a good opportunity to ensure the delivery of sustainable, distinctive residential development in an attractive market location. Gladman consider this site to be suitable for allocation through the</p>	This proposal is noted and the respondent will be aware of the PC's position on the proposal, as noted above.	None

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
		CNP to assist the settlement in achieving sustainable growth as set out in SDC Local Plan Policy T2a and affordable housing, alongside infrastructure improvements which are considered desirable in the locality. SDC have no objections to the principle of development on this site in this location.		
		<p>CONCLUSIONS</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>Gladman welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Regulation 14 Draft Cannington Neighbourhood Plan. These representations have been drafted with reference to the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF2019) and the associated updates that were made to Planning Practice Guidance. Gladman have provided comments on a number of the issues which have been identified in the Cannington Neighbourhood Plan consultation material and that have recommend that the matters raised are carefully explored during the process of preparing the neighbourhood plan for submission to Sedgemoor District Council.</p> <p>We hope you have found these representations informative and useful towards the preparation of the CNP and Gladman welcome any future engagement with the Parish Council to discuss the considerations within forwarded documents.</p> <p>See also Appendix CPC02</p>	Comments noted.	None
12 – Highways England		<p>Thank you for providing Highways England with the opportunity to comment on the pre-submission draft of the Cannington Neighbourhood Plan. We are responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the strategic road network (SRN) which in this instance consists of the M5 motorway, and M5 Junction 23 located approximately 3.7km east of the plan area. During the development of the Sedgemoor Local Plan, Highways England tested the cumulative impact of planned growth on the SRN. On the basis of the work undertaken by Highways England, it has been identified that mitigation at both M5 J23 and A38 Dunball is necessary to safely accommodate the Local Plan as a whole (Plan Policy B16 – Transport).</p> <p>We note that the draft Plan does not seek to allocate specific sites for development in line with the adopted Sedgemoor Local Plan, which proposes</p>	Comment noted.	None

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
		a minimum of 163 houses up to 2032 (including completions and commitments). Similarly, small scale employment is to be supported based on local need where development makes use of existing sites/buildings. We are satisfied that in principle the proposed policies within the Plan are unlikely to result in development which will adversely impact the SRN. However given the proximity to the M5 any development should consider the impact on A38 Dunball and M5 Junction 23 in line with Local Plan Policy B16.		
13 – Historic England		From our records this would seem to be our first involvement in the preparation of your Plan and there are in fact few comments that we wish to offer. We note and applaud the general aim of protecting and enhancing the Plan area's distinctive character through policies which are informed by local evidence. In this respect the Design Guide and Visual Landscape Study are, respectively, particularly noteworthy, as is the identification of local heritage assets. We therefore congratulate your community on its Plan and progress to date, and wish it well in the process of getting the Plan made	Comments noted.	None.
14 – Sedgemoor District Council	Para 2.8	We can confirm that when submitted the Neighbourhood Plan will need to be supported by a SEA screening report and statement reasons for not needing to undertake a SEA. It is likely to also be necessary to undertake a Habitat Regulations Assessment screening exercise. Once the plan has been amended in response to any regulation 14 representations the Parish Council should therefore engage with Sedgemoor on the updated draft of the plan to allow these supporting documents to be prepared and consulted on prior to the Neighbourhood Plan being formally submitted.	Comments noted. We will request the screening opinion, as advised by SDC, when the changes proposed in this table as a result of the representations made have been made.	Contact SDC to request screening opinion when changes to the Reg 14 Plan have been made.
	Chapter 6 context	Data on the population's age range and the number and size of dwellings is taken from the 2011 Census (2.27 - 2.31 and 6.1). They may like to consider using more up to date data (2019 mid-year population estimates and 2018 household projections from ONS). The plan states that 'this demographic profile should be considered when devising policies for this plan' (2.31). Perhaps the plan could make this link more explicit to demonstrate how the evidence gathered has informed the plan's policies.	We have sourced 2019 based figures for parish population and will update the Plan data accordingly. However, we are only aware of household projection	Amend Plan accordingly to reflect updated population data.

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
			<p>figures being available to the district scale and not down to parish level. We will be happy to amend figures in the Plan if SDC can provide parish based household figures.</p> <p>The sentence referred to in 2.31 is one which has remained from early drafts of the Plan and can therefore be deleted.</p>	
	Para 6.4	<p>There is reference to the affordable housing need in the parish that comprises 32 households from the 2018 survey and a further 43 identified from Homefinder Somerset, totalling 75.</p> <p>It might be useful to add a further sentence that says “ <i>Any housing developments promoted specifically to provide for local affordable housing will need to be based on an up to date assessment of needs and these figures are only provide as a broad indication of need in 2018</i>”.</p>	Comments noted. Agree with suggested addition.	Amend Plan text accordingly.
	Para 6.20	The plan refers to a lack of evidence for any particular impact on the housing market in Cannington as a result of the HPC development (6.20). However, the Council was awarded £440,000 via a ‘Housing Contingency Payment’ from EDF in July 2017 in recognition of the threshold of non-homebased workers in Cannington having been exceeded (the threshold was 84 workers and there were 172 non-homebased workers found to be living there). It might be appropriate to reference this noting that the mitigation funds have been used to support housing schemes at Bridgwater and the wider area.	<p>SDC was awarded £440,000</p> <p>Not just Cannington but a cluster of villages Only funding Cannington received was for a HNS survey</p>	None
	Para 6.26	The third bullet point seems to suggest that despite not being supported by the NPPF, a sequential approach is being promoted to the release of development sites. This would not be consistent with the strategic Policy S2 of the adopt Local Plan.	The text supporting the policies has no legal weight. However, we understand that the text as worded could be	Amend text accordingly.

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
		Suggest slight re-wording to emphasise that infill and previously developed site opportunities within the settlement boundary will be maximised – <i>In the interests of responding positively to the climate emergency and associated concerns on degradation of habitats and ecology, development on infill and previously developed sites <u>within the settlement boundary</u> should be <u>maximised</u> a priority, even though national policy prevents a sequential approach to development sites with such sites being used before greenfield sites come forward.</i>	misinterpreted and so we will amend the sentence to re-affirm that the Plan is not seeking to prioritise infill and previously developed land sites ahead of greenfield sites, but that it is important to utilise land in an effective way.	
	Para 6.27	The plan states that policies DEV01, DEV02 and DEV03 seek to respond positively to the Plan's objectives including 'to support the delivery of new housing only at a rate which meets local needs' (6.27). What constitutes 'local needs' isn't defined in 6.27 but elsewhere in the plan it is defined as having a local connection to the area (6.26). Para 6.27 could be rephrased to make it clear that the local connection is only associated with affordable housing.	Paragraph 6.26 does not define "local needs" but based on the comments it is recognised that a definition could be made clearer. We will introduce the words "affordable housing" into objective 4 in paragraph 4.3 and to 6.26 and 6.27.	Amend text accordingly.
	DEV02	Suggest that the policy introduction should also apply to sites that come forward under Local Plan Policy T2b. It is not clear why buildings should be no more than two storeys and it is suggested this is removed. The rest of the bullet point refers to scale, massing, being in keeping with surrounding buildings and these are what will guide what is appropriate. <i>are of a scale, density and massing in-keeping with that of surrounding buildings within the site's setting and are no more than two storeys in height respecting the built character of the village;</i>	Agreed. Strongly disagree. SDC has retrospectively removed the standards they have already applied (13/20/00026). This application was amended in response to Parish Council concerns about 2.5 storeys and buildings	Amend DEV02 accordingly. None

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
		What is the status of the Cannington Local Views/Visual Landscape Study? Is it appended to the plan for examination? If it was consulted upon then potentially it could be adopted as local guidance providing additional weight.	<p>were changed to 2 storeys. This precedent and the reasoning for it is supported in the Plan. The documents pertinent to the application are appended to this table of responses for ease of reference.</p> <p>Yes, it is one of the Plan's appendices and therefore a constituent part of the Plan.</p>	None
	Para 7.4	7.4 The two references to T12: Countryside should be amended to Policy CO1 Countryside	Noted.	Plan to be amended accordingly.
	ENV01	ENV01 refers to locally valued landscape and natural environment features (identified in Table 4 and Figure 13 and 14). This includes for example agricultural land, areas of visual landscape quality that have been identified, priority habitat and trees not currently subject to TPO's. At present some of the policy wording indicates a level of protection to these features over and above that set out in the NPPF. It is also unclear how some of the requirements under point 3 could work in practice (e.g. 'replacing' landscape features). We would therefore recommend the policy wording is revisited to ensure the protection offered and any requirements with regard to mitigation/compensation is commensurate and appropriate to the features value and status, to ensure consistency with the NPPF. In this regard it may be better to address each type of feature separately in the policy wording.	We welcome the comments made and agree that a change to the wording is appropriate to strengthen and make clear the policy intent and interpretation.	Amend policy ENV01 accordingly.
	ENV02	Policy ENV02 states that the locally valued heritage assets identified in table 5 and figures 15 and 16 together with nationally recognised heritage assets will be protected from adverse impact by avoiding or mitigating such impacts. Local Plan policy D26 gives mitigation as one of a number of options relating	We welcome the comments made and agree that a change to the wording is	Amend policy ENV02 accordingly.

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
		<p>to development impacting upon designated heritage assets and does not refer to mitigation at all in relation to non-designated heritage assets. For non-designated assets the weight given to their conservation should be based on the assets significance and magnitude of harm, weighed against the benefits of the development. By requiring mitigation in all circumstances where avoidance of impact is not possible, ENV02 will not be in conformity with Local Plan policy D26 or the NPPF. It is suggested that this policy is re-worded to reflect the different levels of protection that designated and non-designated heritage assets have to ensure greater consistency with Policy D26.</p> <p>Criteria 3 for EVN02 relates to gardens and requires applicants to provide an analysis of proposal's plot size(s) and building footprint in relation to garden areas of the dwellings in the surrounding area'. This criteria is primarily about ensuring that new development respects existing character in terms of scale, density etc and could be included within the design and access statement. It is suggested therefore that the criteria is amended as follows <i>"....applicants should <u>include</u> an analysis of the proposal's plot size(s) and building footprint in relation to garden areas of the dwellings in the surrounding area <u>within the submitted design and access statement.</u>"</i></p>	<p>appropriate to strengthen and make clear the policy intent and interpretation.</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Amend policy ENV02 accordingly.</p>
	TRANS01	<p>Suggest some re-wording of the policy, for example <i>"Proposals for major development <u>that are consistent with other policies in the development plan will be supported where:</u>"</i></p>	<p>We do not agree that the change is necessary as it is implicit that the Plan (including other components of the development plan) should be read as a whole. However, as the LPA has raised the issue in relation to this policy in particular, assuming that there is a good reason for re-affirming</p>	<p>Amend text accordingly.</p>

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
		<p>i) Suggest deleting reference to volume, minimising any adverse impact is the key issue.</p> <p>ii) Suggest reference to the Somerset County Council car parking standards in this policy.</p> <p>2. Is this part of the policy effectively applying to all development whereas part 1. Is only major development?</p> <p>I think the justification to exceed SCC parking standards needs to be expanded on in the supporting text but note it is linked to existing issues and not wishing to make these worse by new development.</p>	<p>this point in this policy, we will make the suggest change.</p> <p>We consider that reference to volume is important, from the community perspective at least. However, it is recognised that adding reference to minimising adverse impact could be beneficial to the policy.</p> <p>Reference is already made in the TRANS01 policy, in part 2, which applies to all development and not just major development referred to under TRANS01 part 1.</p> <p>Yes. We can reaffirm this point by adding “all” into the policy in part 2.</p> <p>Yes, we agree that it is worth strengthening the reasoning behind supporting proposals</p>	<p>Amend text accordingly.</p> <p>None</p> <p>Amend text accordingly.</p> <p>Amend text accordingly.</p>

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
		<p>The policy could be more explicit in terms of identifying/allocating additional village centre parking and identifying this as a priority for CIL expenditure for example.</p> <p>Overall, the policy is supported, and it is noted that it includes support for new walking and cycling links to be provided as part of any major developments. This is consistent with both the Local Plan and the Climate Emergency Action Plan.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan would be an opportunity to identify specific walking or cycle links within the parish that could be prioritised as well as providing support for other active travel infrastructure such as cycle stands/storage if appropriate.</p>	<p>which exceed parking standards as SDC has suggested.</p> <p>The PC has a dedicated brief for a Councillor to explore footpaths issues further. This reference can be added to the supporting text of the Plan in section 11.</p>	Amend accordingly.
	ECON01	In terms of marketing, perhaps include the length of the marketing exercise, 12 - 18 months for example	We agree that this is sensible and will add a minimum period of 12 months.	Amend accordingly.
	Para 10.6	10.6 reference to DM18: Education Provision of the Sedgemoor Core Strategy. The Education Provision Policy is D27 in the adopted Local Plan	Agree to change suggested.	Amend accordingly.
	COM01	Suggest amending the first sentence to read <i>“Development proposals for or which result in the provision of or improvement to the following projects <u>and are consistent with other policies in the neighbourhood plan</u> will be supported in principle...”</i>	Agree to change suggested.	Amend accordingly.
15. Somerset County Council Estates		I write on behalf of Somerset County Council’s (SCC) Education Authority regarding our support for the plan and to provide comments to help the plan going forward. Following from the review of the Cannington Neighbourhood Plan, Regulation 14 (Pre-submission) and Community consultation draft, we are in approval of the plan. As Education Authority we carefully examine the capacity of all the schools in Somerset to ensure they meet the demand of pupils moving into their respective area. We have regular discussions with the local authority and the schools, so if they reach the pupil capacity our job is to resolve the issue, by exploring ways to accommodate the demand. Please find	Comments noted.	None

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
		<p>further comments structured to respond to particular policies, paragraphs, pages and sections of the Plan which relate to education or SCC land holdings: Section 10. EDUCATION & TRAINING FACILITIES Cannington C of E primary, catchment boundary is shown in Appendix 4 the catchment covers some of the neighbouring parishes: With reference to para 10.8 SCC as education authority have a parking policy for schools which is there to encourage sustainable transport to schools. The schools are only permitted a certain number of spaces for staff as follows: Somerset County Council planning policy, PPS4 for non-residential parking for cars states: Primary Schools & Secondary Schools: 1 space per 2 FTE staff + 2 visitor spaces Also, for Blue Badge parking at this location: 2% of the total parking capacity (minimum 1 space) plus one additional space for each disabled employee. More information can be found in the link below: https://docs.somerset.gov.uk/wl/?id=Wtxi7qvLKRbfpByVntKaiLapmMmMOjki We have regular discussions with Sedgemoor District Council and the schools regarding the capacity to accommodate the pupils moving into the area (Cannington and Haygrove) In reference to paragraph 10.4, if the data indicates that schools may reach the pupil capacity our role is to resolve the issue, by exploring ways to accommodate the demand i.e., by expanding facilities or remodelling. Additionally, we have the following information on various SCC landholdings within your NP boundary. If there are any developments or decisions which impact on the following sites in appendix 1, please contact us again.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Brymore Academy (Figure 1) • Land and Property Holdings – the Education trustees manage the grounds and buildings shown in yellow with turquoise outline 2. Cannington bypass (Figure 2) • Land and Property Holdings - Highway's freehold 3. Cannington C of E Primary School (Figure 3) • Land and Property Holdings - Buildings and land to the left of the yellow area is managed by the Education trustees, however, land to the right is education freehold 4. Land off High Street, Cannington (Figure 4) • Land and Property Holdings - Land is education freehold 		Please amend

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
		<p>5. Land of Rodway highways (Figure 5) • Land and Property holdings – land is SCC highways owned</p> <p>6. The Old Vicarage (Figure 6) • Land and Property Holdings - Social Services leasehold</p> <p>Furthermore, our 2019 Infrastructure Growth Plan indicates that Cannington primary school will have to bring space back into use to accommodate the new children moving into the area. This implies that there will be a spare classroom which can be used again. Please contact the school directly for more information.</p> <p>It has come to our attention that the school named 'Bridgwater & Taunton College' in the Neighbourhood Plan refers to Bridgwater College Academy, which is what it is called now. As an 'All through' School our data shows this is not in the Cannington Catchment Area, although it is an academy so this technically does not have a boundary. The actual secondary school catchment which the whole of Cannington Parish, and especially attendees of the Cannington Primary school are in is the Haygrove secondary school. Catchment. Please see Appendix 2 for clarity.</p> <p>Finally, please find in appendix 3 the Somerset Organisation Plan (SOP) of Bridgwater indicating the capacity and forecast pupil numbers for the schools in 2021, which I believe may help to create a more accurate idea of the school system in the area for Cannington NP group.</p> <p>If you need anything from us at Somerset County Council, please feel free to contact me using my details at the top of this letter.</p> <p>See also Appendix CPC03</p>		
16. Natural England		<p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made. Natural England does not have any specific comments on the draft Cannington Neighbourhood Plan. However, we refer you to the attached</p>	Comments noted.	None.

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment ¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any
		annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan. For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk . See also Appendix CPC04		
17. Ofcom		<p>Case Reference: 01266274</p> <p>Dear Customer,</p> <p>We have received your request and a member of the Licensing team will be processing your enquiry in due course. Your Case Reference number is provided above, and we would ask you to ensure this is quoted on all future communications.</p> <p><u>March 2021 – Important information for new licence applications</u></p> <p>We would like to inform you that Ofcom has published a <u>General Notice</u> and notified other licensees of our proposals to vary a wide range of licences to require licensees to comply with the ICNIRP general public limits and keep records to demonstrate how they comply. This licence variation process is now underway, and we are now in a transition period.</p> <p>During this transition period, Ofcom will still accept new applications and will still issue licences. If you decide to apply for a licence impacted by the change (or continue with a licence application) during this time, we will take this as you consenting to these future changes.</p> <p>To view the General Notice or find more information please visit our website: ofcom.org.uk/emf.</p>	Comments noted.	None.
18. Coal Authority		<p>Thank you for your email below regarding the Cannington Neighbourhood Plan Consultation.</p> <p>The Coal Authority is only a statutory consultee for coalfield Local Authorities. As Sedgemoor District Council is outside the coalfield, there is no requirement for you to consult us and / or notify us of any emerging neighbourhood plans.</p>	Comments noted.	None.
20. Canal and River Trust		Thank you for consulting the Canal & River Trust on the Regulation 14 Consultation for the Cannington NHP. As the Trust do not own or maintain assets within the plan area we have no comments to make and may be removed from future consultations.	Comments noted.	None.

Respondent (anonymised where an individual)	Section / Page / Policy to which comment applies	Respondent Comment¹	Steering Group / Parish Council Response	Change to Plan text or policy, if any

Appendix 1 – Details of change from 2.5 to 2 storeys in application number 13-20-00026

ORIGINAL



CANNINGTON, BRIDGWATER - SITE LAYOUT

Pegasus

19th November 2020

Please complete the various sections of the form below as appropriate and return to the Head of Development Services.

Name of Parish/Town Council	CANNINGTON PARISH COUNCIL
Application Reference	13/20/00026
Location	Land to the North of, Grange Farm, Main Rd, Cannington

	Tick if appropriate
This Council has no observations to offer.	
This Council objects this proposal on the following valid planning grounds:-	✓
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Plot 45 is too close to the boundary and the properties of No 7 and No 8 Priory Close and will cause overlooking/overshadowing of these properties. In addition, there is a small area of 'vacant, barren land' in the vicinity of this plot that requires adopting/landscaping as it could lead to misuse. We do not want 2.5 storey houses in the village. We would like these amended to 2 storeys in keeping with the character of the surrounding area and village. There are none in the village and we do not want to set a precedent that would permit gradual urbanisation. This development is at the entrance to the village so must not give the impression that people are entering an urban area. The southern boundary of the development adjacent to the roundabout, is a considerable length of wooden fencing. We would like this to be sufficiently landscaped and softened to make the estate look more appealing. We would like the position of the play area to be re-assessed on safety grounds. It is positioned on the banks of the flood alleviation scheme channel and attenuation pond. 	
If our observations coincide with those of the Group Manager, in accordance with the delegation scheme, we accept that the application will not be reported to the Development Control Committee unless one of the other exceptions in the delegation scheme apply.	✓

Signed:

Date: 14 January 2021



Aly Prowse
Deputy Clerk to Cannington Parish Council

canningtonparishcouncil@cannington.org.uk

From: Adrian Noon <adrian.noon@sedgemoor.gov.uk>
Sent: 10 March 2021 18:55
To: canningtonparishcouncil@cannington.org.uk
Subject: RE: [OFFICIAL] - Planning 13/20/00026

I am waiting for a bundle of amended drawings which will go out for reconsultation and hopefully pick up of the pC's comments where possible

From: canningtonparishcouncil@cannington.org.uk <canningtonparishcouncil@cannington.org.uk>
Sent: 10 March 2021 11:47
To: Adrian Noon <adrian.noon@sedgemoor.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: [OFFICIAL] - Planning 13/20/00026

Thank you Adrian

Councillors would like reassurance that our reasons for objecting to this application are being dealt with and if they are not resolved the application will go to Development committee for consideration.

Kind Regards
Tina

[Tina Gardener](#)
Clerk
Cannington Parish Council
(01278) 653322
canningtonparishcouncil@cannington.org.uk
www.cannington.org.uk

From: Adrian Noon <adrian.noon@sedgemoor.gov.uk>
Sent: 08 March 2021 19:05
To: canningtonparishcouncil@cannington.org.uk
Subject: RE: [OFFICIAL] - Planning 13/20/00026

Hi Tina

We are still resolved a couple of minor/technical matters . I hope the decision can be issued by the end of the month

regards

Adrian

From: canningtonparishcouncil@cannington.org.uk <canningtonparishcouncil@cannington.org.uk>
Sent: 08 March 2021 11:41
To: Adrian Noon <adrian.noon@sedgemoor.gov.uk>
Subject: [OFFICIAL] - Planning 13/20/00026

Dear Adrian

We are concerned that planning application 13/20/00026 on land by Grange Farm has still not been decided. Could you please let me know when a decision is likely?

[illegible]

Pegasus
THE

34

Please complete the various sections of the form below as appropriate and return to the Head of Development Services.

Name of Parish/Town Council	CANNINGTON PARISH COUNCIL
Application Reference	13/20/00026 (As amended)
Location	Land to the North of, Grange Farm, Main Road, Cannington

	Tick if appropriate
This Council has no observations to offer.	
This Council objects this proposal on the following valid planning grounds:-	✓
<p>The parish council objection remains regarding the proposed 2.5 storey houses on this development as per our original response dated 14.1.21</p>	
If our observations coincide with those of the Group Manager, in accordance with the delegation scheme, we accept that the application will not be reported to the Development Control Committee unless one of the other exceptions in the delegation scheme apply.	✓

Signed:

Date: 29 March 2021



Aly Prowse
Deputy Clerk to Cannington Parish Council

2nd AMENDMENT



CANNINGTON, BRIDGWATER - SITE LAYOUT

Pegasus Design

[GETTING STARTED](#) | [ABOUT](#) | [PLANNING](#) | [TECHNICAL](#) | [CONTACT](#)

www.prestonplus.co.uk | TERMINATING BY: S/H/THAI | APPROVED BY: S/H | DATE: 19/02/20 | SCALE: 1:100 (B.W.) | DRWG: PPA-2008-01 | SHEET NO. | REV: V | CLIENT: CREST NICHOLSON

19th April 2021