

Cam Neighbourhood Plan - Regulation 14 Comments and Responses Table

LGS - Local Green Space

no.	Page / Clause / Para	Comment	Proposal (where relevant)	Proposed resolution
1	Appendix 3	<p>The Cam Design Code as described in Appendix 3 is a strong set of codes which offers guidance to new developments that may be proposed in Cam Parish. It's something that can be used to ensure locally distinct and sensitive approach to development in Cam. It underpins policies on environment, local character and distinctiveness as well as access and movement. Cam is a strategic housing location, outside of the scope of this Neighbourhood Plan, but Cam Parish Council and residents wish to ensure the community's distinct character is given great weight in all stages of the allocation and design of development.</p> <p>POLICY CAMES1 Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity</p> <p>POLICY CAMCD2 Cam's Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows</p> <p>And all the Policies put forwards</p> <p>Use this NDP</p>		Noted
2	P11	<p>P11 I like the vision of Cam for the future which refers to a range of elements come together to contribute to people's quality of life, their health and happiness including access to walking and cycling. It refers to the network of green snickets and green spaces together with mature trees support both people and wildlife. Links to the countryside are a defining characteristic of Cam, which has become known for its 'garden village' qualities where the historic and the modern are blended together through an extended green infrastructure.</p> <p>I support the idea of a stronger local economy and opportunities being made for created for small local businesses.</p> <p>I look forward to the Cam & Dursley Greenway giving a route to the station to walkers and cyclists, which passes through the centre of the village.</p> <p>The vision of the centre of the village offering a good range of shops and facilities and has a distinct identity and character is backed up by the Village Centre framework discussion document which offers food for thought.</p> <p>I like the way the document is in sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment and Sustainability Local Character and Distinctiveness Movement and Connectivity Community Facilities and Services Employment Cam Village Centre <p>Every section offers a comprehensive view and Policies for developers to follow and a full and informative explanation.</p> <p>I would support all the Policies put forward in these sections.</p>		Noted

3	Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity, Local Green Spaces	Our village is growing so large because we so say have the infrastructure to support more development. This makes protection of our green spaces within the community more important than ever. Recent small high density developments have minimal gardens or green areas included in the design. This is unhealthy for the residents and unattractive for the community. There is much evidence available now that nature, greenery and trees are good for people's health and wellbeing and for the environment. I support anything Cam Parish Council and Stroud District Council can do to promote this. I am in agreement with all aspects of the draft document as it stands and would vote YES to its adoption in a referendum.		Noted
4	General	My husband and I visit friends in both Cam and Dursley on a regular basis and we are looking to move to Cam. We love the rural aspect of the place but also like how easy it is to get to Bristol and Cheltenham. We know a lot of development is planned and it's very disappointing to think of somewhere we feel is like home is going to be ruined. Anything you can do to stop the area becoming another Quedgeley or allowing developers to build row upon row of Lego houses gets our support. I like the sound of the design codes and making homes truly sustainable. I also like the idea of keeping the local green spaces and maintaining a sylvan aspect to Cam. I love the drive into Cam from the A38 and seeing all the trees. I really despair when I see every area of land being built on.		Noted
5	Local Green Spaces	All the local green spaces should be saved but especially the four in Upper Cam. The village has had enough to put up with Littlecombe being built. Having local green spaces keeps the village feel of the area.		Noted
6	General, local green spaces	I agree with everything you are trying to do but particularly the local green spaces.		Noted
7	Green infrastructure, local green spaces, woodland and special trees.	As a regular visitor to the area as a lover of nature and for birdwatching you must protect what you have. When it's gone it's gone for good. So much of Cam has already been spoilt. Save the trees, hedges and the local green spaces or it will become a concrete jungle. Save the views from Cam Peak and the long down. Dont build in back gardens.		Noted
8	General, Local Green Spaces	Mainly the LGS but in general the plan is very good. Protecting all the proposed LGS is vital to the youngsters of the parish and in particular the Cam Sports Ground is my priority to be a protected area the number of people adults down to young children have many hours of pleasure using this area. In general I think everything is covered . Of utmost importance is with the new houses we have jobs,schools, doctors and road infrastructure.		Noted
9	General, local green spaces	A good overall plan. Cam Sports Ground must be protected for the future of our youngsters and adults		Noted
10	General	What is the mitigation to offset the complete destruction of hedges along Box road?	Destruction of hedges. Developers could leave hedges intact along Box road and build the estate behind. Bellway have done this one Wickwar.	If removal of a hedge is proposed as part of a planning application then its impact on bio-diversity and character of the area may be taken into account in accordance with planning policies in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Local Development Plan. Policy CAMES1 aims to prevent where possible loss of assets such as hedgerows, and appropriate replacement where not.

11	Page 48 Policy CAMCF2 ref LG59 Street Farm Field and LGS10 Riverside Land at Everlands	<p>My garden at our house on St Georges Close lies directly adjacent to LGS10 Riverside land at Everlands and ends at the field between St Georges Close and Everlands LG59 Street Farm Field?? LGS10 is an area of woodland that includes part of the river cam which runs alongside our garden. My own trees and shrubs lie directly next to this land and along the riverbank. I believe that our land finishes in the centre of the river. In the 5 years that we have lived in St Georges Close we have seen an abundance of wildlife including heron, badgers, foxes, deer, ducks, moorhens, otters, squirrels, owls, bats, snakes, trout, kingfishers, woodpeckers plus at least 6 other breeds of bird. If we were to lose this area of woodland then we would not only lose our beautiful view from our house which would have an adverse affect on our family and devalue our property but we would also lose the huge amount of wildlife that have made it their home. This area is regularly used by dog walkers, scouts and local schools. It is also on a flood plain so would make any property subject to flooding. The field between the bottom of our garden and Everlands is also home to much of the same wildlife that I described earlier. The field has flooded several times in the last few years which again makes it unsuitable for building on. Any builds on this would also affect our view and devalue our property.</p> <p>Keep as many green spaces as possible, provide a home for nature and don't spoil the beauty of Cam.</p>		Noted, more detail in LGS Report
12	General	I don't believe that Cam has sufficient school places, doctors surgeries or other amenities to support an increase in its population. If we carry on building on empty fields then we will be even more overloaded than we already are. Plus nothing is done to prevent people buying these new houses to rent them out at vast sums of money. This does not help anyone get on the property ladder, it merely lines the pockets of builders and landlords.		This is a noted as an important point, however this is outside the scope of this Plan.
13	General	Seems to me a very detailed plan which protects the Cam environment and persona. Good job by those involved in developing the plan - it would be good to see the connectivity with the railway station improved for walkers and cyclists: from Uley, from Outer Cam and from the centre.	Protecting the surrounding areas/views from AONB; saving trees and hedges rows and wildlife corridors.	Noted
14	General	I am very happy to see that green spaces are to be protected and would support the inclusion of all of them. When Dursley and Cam creep ever closer together, I would like to see the village aspect of Upper Cam Protected.		Noted
15	General	I am very keen to protect the green spaces mentioned in the plan. With so much building going on we need to maintain these key areas.		Noted
16	Design Code	It is most important to have guidelines for future building. There is to be a very high amount of building in Cam in the future and we need to have it built to a good design so that Cam is not ruined. I hope the design code has teeth as there are some aggressive developers about.		Noted
17	General	For me the most important pages are the sections including the design code, the protected green spaces, and the vision for the future. I am keen to prevent building on these areas used by children to play on, and people to walk their dogs, have picnics etc., acting as lungs to the built up area. I like the ideas for future projects and hope these will be pursued. I hope future building can be restricted to north Cam as Cam is having to absorb a lot of new building already.		Noted

18	P12, movement and Communications	Developments at littlecombe and Box road will add considerably to through traffic as Cam becomes more of a commuter centre for Glos and Bristol. Lack of planning for traffic via junction enhancements at Kingshill and Box road is considered a serious omission	The establishment of development boundaries using the Cotswold area of outstanding natural beauty and view points.	Highways issues such as junction enhancements are outside the scope of this plan
19	General	Parking on the roads is becoming a issue with property already. Built on the high street no drive way space .These new houses will probably have two spaces it's not enough more teenagers are driving than ever .A safe exit from box road for the volume of cars .How is the train station going to cope .drs and dentist another problem. Safety on to the oncoming traffic,volume of cars. Parking will be a issue car parking for visitors	There should be a agreement with builders to provide for the community.	Gloucestershire County Council set the parking standards for private residential and non-residential development.
20	General	Your emphasis on the protection and care of the green spaces, in balance with maintaining Cam as a place of employment and a lovely place to live, ' a garden village' is encouraging. It is quite a balancing act to hold together but thank you for all the hard work and thought that has gone into this plan. Speaking as Vicar of St George's, a large building within the area, I hope that we can have open doors to community events and meetings to bring that sense of 'Cammunity' which you desire. I am very fortunate to live amongst the older part of Cam and thank you for your desire to keep its distinctive character - I know that will be very much appreciated by the locals who live here too. I agree with the emphasis on making walking and cycling a priority. An emphasis on good mental health and wellbeing can be positively helped in making being outside easier and I am pleased to see this is part of your plan. I believe the part that the local church can play in 'Cammunity' was not mentioned specifically in your report but it is an integral part of the life in Cam and hopefully would be kept in mind as developments grow. I know Bishop Robert, Bishop of Tewkesbury has a specific interest where there are new housing estates. Anglican priests are being encouraged to get trained up and involved when new housing estates arise. Thank you again for all who have worked so hard in getting this important piece of work completed.	I am very much aware of that critical balance between keeping enough new build happening to keep an area alive and viable but not losing the 'garden village' that we all so enjoy. It seems to me that what you are trying to do in this plan is to ensure that the developers do not lose sight of this and make it a priority. How much can they be the ones who fund the new cycle ways, new footpaths and new facilities which need to be built? see above . We have also discussed this and encouraged one another in our Sunday services to read the Plan and make comments.	Noted
21		In the ligh of the Cam Development Plan it is the right time to send you an update regarding burial spaces. We currently have potential capacity for around 90 new burials. So far this year we have had 7 burials. The figure now includes parishioners from Lower Cam. Based on these number (though it is impotant to remember that burials are really difficult to predict) we have between 10 & 12 years left of burial space. Prior to our letter of Oct 2014 we understand a figure of 25 years was submitted and this was just for Cam Parish. We do have old areas of burial ground that could possible be reused for new burials but it will need considerable work and it is likely that the church would require financial assistance to undertake this. This is certainly what the church would like to do and avoid ultimately church yard closure. It may be that the Parish Council needs to set aside land for use as a cemety too. We would be more than happy to discuss this situation with members of the council and to help plan for future burials in Cam.		Noted
22	Page 48 and 54	In general I support the NDP policies particularly the green spaces proposals and the improvements in the centre to improve the safety for pedestrians at the roundabout and measures to reduce traffic speeds. There are no parts of the plan that do not agree with		Noted with thanks

23	POLICY CAMCF1, Cam & Dursley Train Station	POLICY CAMCF1: Should the small but very useful chemist shop be included here? Provides an important facility. Cam & Dursley Train Station: The plan correctly highlights the parking problems. Perhaps it is time that the facility is advertised (e.g. on the A38) as a Park & Ride!		Noted. The chemist cannot be included in CAMCF1 as it is a retail operation operating under Class A1 of the Use Classes Order. The chemist facility could be lost through the premises becoming a different retail business, and the planning policy cannot protect against this.
24	General	In general: From my limited understanding I think that the plan provides an excellent framework for the inevitable development that will take place. In particular, the plans emphasis on the "garden village" aim should be helpful. Local consultation on plans CAMCD4 is important.		Noted
25	CamCD1 Cam CD2 Cam CD4 CF1 CamE1 CamE2	I very strongly support the creation of Local Green Spaces (CAMCF2), in particular: LGS10 Riverside, land at Everlands LGS7 Cam Sports Ground LGS8 Littlecombe Meadow LGS9 Street Farm Field I also support the policies set out in CAMES, CAMCD, CAMMC1.		Noted, more detail in LGS Report
26	General	Anything that can be done to prevent ruining the rest of Cam is a good idea. I fully support it and think the plan is a good idea. The landowners say Street Farm field is not tranquil or beautiful. This is just not true. It is a very peaceful and tranquil area. The only occasional traffic noise is from cars arriving in Old Court. The field itself is not beautiful but the views of the woods up to the golf course are beautiful all year round.	Designating Littlecombe Meadow and Street Farm Field Local Green Spaces. These affect me specifically because my house backs onto the field but I agree with all the other proposals as well. We need the space to stop us joining up with Dursley. Since my late husband and I moved here 18 years ago I have seen an increase in all kinds of people enjoying the footpaths through to the adjoining fields. My own grandchildren who have lived with me and attended Rednock School used the footpaths to walk to school and I walk my dogs in both areas daily.	Noted, more detail in LGS Report
27	LGS7, LGS8, LGS9, LGS10	The plan is progressive, yet sympathetic to the essence of a green Village - please do not move back from these principles. In general ... we are delighted to see these as designated green spaces. They protect the heart of Old Cam ... we would advocate at all costs these are retained as present and future community assets. The risk that Green areas may be sacrificed in the future ... please do ensure we protect these community assets for all parishioners now and in the future.	As above, but in particular to preserve LGS7... the true community heart of Old Cam ... Sport is essential to form cohesive bonds to the community, both young, to develop and experience team games during and post school years and as a way to support and give back to the youth of the community through coaching and social networks.	Noted, more detail in LGS Report
28	Page 34	In general support the policies	the green infrastructure and its protection in the NDP	Noted with thanks
29	General	Local employment is KEY to Cam development. Home working is an option but what about a centralised hub for those who can conduct most of their work online. The hub would rent out space to companies who can allow their workers to work offsite.		This comment is beyond the scope of the plan
30	General	Agree development of the village centre is KEY to creating a village atmosphere. The roundabout is a problem. We really need a good pub with food and more shops.		Noted

31	General	Obviously a lot of work has gone into this plan and credit to those involved. I am aware that the NDP has a specific objective which excludes some issues addressed by my comments. Time will tell if we can achieve the vibrant garden village atmosphere we all aspire to.		Noted with thanks
32	P2	Page 2 says NDP can not be ignored by developers, but Page 6 says NDP is for consideration by SDC. This surely means SDC can override anything in the NDP.		The Plan still has a number of required stages to progress through before it becomes part of the Development Plan for Stroud when it will be used together with the Local Plan, along with any material planning considerations to make planning decisions. It needs to be in general conformity with the Stroud Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.
33	P7	There is no mention on infrastructure, roads, schools etc. I know this maybe outwith from NDP but not sure how this will interact with SDC/Highways.		Outside the scope of this Plan.
34	P8	Cam is a strategic housing location but is outside NDP. ! Both these points suggest that it will be SDC who will call all the shots when it comes to build and infrastructure.		The detail provided in the Cam NDP will positively inform and shape future development. It can not be used to block development such as that strategically allocated by Stroud District.
35	P17	Cycle ways agree but what about down Uphorpe lane		Noted
36	P21	Agree we should target the 'garden village' but we need more trees in the centre. Maybe get rid of mini roundabout status, make it into a curbed roundabout with a green centre.		Noted
37	P24	Really agree with Visual quality to AONB. Figure 8 is not referenced anywhere and no explanation on what 50m & 70m contours mean.		Noted - Figure 8 now referenced and importance of 50m contour line reinforced.
38	P34	Agree any tree loss should be replaced but with mature trees.		Noted
39	P35	There should be a target for increased tree canopy. Page 21 - There is no mention of litter policy.		Noted. Litter policy is outside of the scope of this Plan.
40	P38	Do not agree that pre-application is not legal. Why would developers just ignore it (as they do now!)		Applicants cannot be legally required. This policy aims to strengthen pre-application engagement in Cam Parish as far as possible.
41	P51	Change of use? - 1 year too short.		Noted
42	P53	Rackleaze should be landscaped into a park together with the river and have access from Tesco carpark.		Noted - best options for Rackleaze will continue to be explored and enabled by Parish Council and Stroud Valleys Project.
43	P58	Projects - Encourage parents to walk to Hopton school. Include signage to limit time parking.		Noted - and added to the projects section
44	General	Very Good, to keep green plan. I think it's extremely important to keep the green spaces, and the work done by your committee is excellent	All of the plan	Noted with thanks
45	P37	What about Water harvesting for existing houses?		Outside the scope of this Plan.
46	General	Please adopt the plan and save the character of our village . We are already overdeveloped! It's time for other villages in the Stroud Valleys to step up their housing. We have already done our bit and more!	Preserving our green spaces	Noted
47	p43	Snicket map should be readily available.		Noted
48	P8	Design Code is a great idea – please Stroud DC adopt this and police it well		Noted with thanks
49	P12	Cam Village Centre: as more housing developed, a strong sense of place at the centre will become more important	Consider promoting more community 'calendar' events at Winterbotham Hall, Rackleaze, etc – like Christmas lights but at different times of year	Outside the scope of this Plan
50	P22	Building with Nature. An opportunity here to ensure all new housing developments match or exceed the natural landscaping of current Littlecombe estate	Encourage advisory partnership between developers and Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust and other conservation bodies	Noted

	P34	Treescapes. Hugely important in our landscape	Perhaps appoint (volunteer) parish tree warden to log all trees, recommend TPOs etc	Noted
51	P48	Local Greenspaces. We don't have enough of them, even considering close proximity to countryside.	Let's not lose any.	Noted
52	Policy CAM CF2 LGS designations; pp48-49	<p>I am strongly in favour of the inclusion of the land known as Riverside, Everlands Cam (LGS10) as a designated Local Green Space within the Cam NDP 2019-31.</p> <p>I have enjoyed viisting this land all of my life having walked across it countless times: when going to school at Cam Hopton in the 1970s and 80s, playing cricket and football as part of birthday celebrations, catching my biggest ever wild brown trout in 1988; walking along the old Dursley branch line whilst it was still accessible; paddling a canoe up the river from the area around the Scout hut; walking to and from church as a chorister and then later until this day; carrying out my dissertation on the impact of the Listers engineering factory when I was a student at GLOSCAT in 1989 (the water quality was surprisingly good) and on countless other occasions since.</p> <p>The landowners have expressed their concerns and objected to the designation and appointed a planning consultant, whose comments have appeared within the appendix of this draft NDC plan. I do not agree with the assertions made. To me, this area of land LGS10 fully meets all of the criteria for a designated Local Green Space.</p> <p>LGS10 is one of the most significant wildlife sites remaining within the heart of the village. Although the water vole that bred here became extinct in the 1990s, other key species such as grey heron and kingfisher remain and the increasing woodland is home to species such as tree creeper, nuthatch, chiff chaff and black cap.</p> <p>The ancient veteran oaks have been designated with Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) for their amenity and historic value (the medieval / post-medieval titheway from Norman Hill to St George's Church passes this land) and the broad-leaved woodland, scrub thickets, Cotswold riverside area and pockets of grassland and sedge fen provide a very diverse range of habitats uncommon in the parish which are home to many different animals and plants.</p>	<p>The recent developments at Box Road have been a missed opportunity. I support s106 agreements that direct monies from each new house into biodiversity conservation, but by spending this outside the parish (within the Severn estuary SAC) rather than within Cam parish it feels as if yet again the amenity and heritage needs of Cam itself are not being adequately met.</p> <p>Governmental pressure will continue to be brought to bear on Cam for ever more houses, but I believe we are depauperate in our amenity given the massive development pressures we have faced since the 1970s.</p> <p>The people of places like Painswick and Rodborough always opined to Stroud District Council "Stick our district quota of houses in Cam". Rightly or wrongly that has always felt like a Council policy decision. Hopefully this draft plan is a vitally important step in a balanced and reasonable approach to our future needs.</p> <p>We need to develop spaces for nature within Cam which reach towards the Cotswold AONB and towards the Severn estuary RAMSAR site. This need not preclude further developments taking place, but it should be at the forefront of our strategic thinking and planning, not just an afterthought.</p>	Noted, this comment is incorporated in LGS Report
53		<p>It is true that the old railway line has become obscured by growth of trees and scrub but in places it is accessible and the old Gallows Bridge is a constant reminder of the historic importance of this part of Cam's industrial archaeology and heritage and it should be valued and protected. It is one of the longest remaining sections of this important part of our cultural heritage.</p> <p>With the recent Littlecombe developments and the Norman Hill housing estates being built from the mid 1970s onwards there are now perhaps 3,000 people living within a 10 minute walk of this very accessible green space. For successive generations of people, these represent the first field of real countryside that meet as they explore their parish as they should. It does have expansive views to Cam Longdown and Cam Peak and feels like a real gateway for people in the parish as they walk, run, cycle or ride towards the fields and hills that surround the village.</p> <p>Wildlife, heritage and accessibility " this site has everything and must be protected for future generations to enjoy growing up in this beautiful village as much as I did. Fortunately it meets the legal criteria and passes with flying colours.</p>		See above

54	General	I think the overall general plan is very good, I like the idea of the connectivity by bike or walking, and the use of trees which will keep the rural feel of the parish. I would support this plan, I like the idea of bringing together the different parts of Cam around a community hub	We need to develop spaces for nature within Cam which reach towards the Cotswold AONB and towards the Severn estuary RAMSAR site. This need not preclude further developments taking place, but it should be at the forefront of our strategic thinking and planning, not just an afterthought.	Noted - CAMES1 aims to enable that but practical projects outside the scope of this plan could also deliver this aim.
55	Housing Quality O6	With any housing development there will be a certain amount of CO2 generated. Are there any metrics used for the amount of CO2 generated in the development that feeds into the sustainable design and construction of housing development?		Building and other Regulations on this matter are changing in response to climate emergency.
56	Cam CF2	I firstly would like to commend all the hard work that has gone into this proposal/ plan. I would like to see Cam Village Centre develop beyond Tesco and return to its roots of independent traders which i think given the desire for a carbon neutral world by many is a distinct possibility. Energy, time and investment would be needed although this is an exciting phase for Cam and I believe great things could happen. Many moving into the area are doing so looking for a better quality of life, often money rich and time poor. There is an opening for the development of a community store that focuses on sustainability as well as creating premises that could be utilised by charity... another growing industry for the eco-friendly individual. I welcome discussing this further, kind regards,		Noted with thanks
57		The importance of supporting infrastructure especially in relation to the train station that is not being used fully by local residents due to parking issues, and i would also advocate the development of cycle routes/ safe pathways to connect the area.		Noted
58	Local Green Space	I strongly support the keeping of these green spaces that have childhood memories and especially Littlecombe Meadow where I now reside as I selected this location due to position to this green space, and the surrounding area.		Noted
59	General	The detailed survey of existing trees and their importance to the feel of the village, the retention of the network of snickets, many of which I use on a regular basis. The protection of the highlighted green spaces is of vital importance for the well being (both physical and mental) of the residents of our community.		Noted
60		Much of your justification are lies or untruths. I have "managed" this piece of land (LGS10) since it came into the current ownership exactly 40 years ago and bred sheep on it for ~25 years. The field has never been used by the Scout movement in my time, however, i did have a request from a scout leader about 10 years ago asking if they could pitch their tents in return for keeping the land tidy, BUT this applied to the field north(next to the Scout Hut) of LGS10 which is not included in your draft. As i also managed this land i did get permission for them to use it but they never took it up anyway. With regard to a playing field, it has never been used as such, although i do remember asking someone riding a motorbike to leave. The pedestrian footbridge is complete! It is not a mature woodland, it was always a pasture meadow but in recent years the pollarded willows have seeded themselves and spread into the pasture alongside. There are many mature trees, bordering the disused railway line, now choked with ivy, that are likely to fall in a storm making these areas dangerous. There is an abundance of wildlife	Unless this area is cleared and made safe (even the ancient oaks regularly shed their branches and these would need to be fenced off) it is totally unsuitable as a Local Green Space	Noted. This proposed Local Green Space evidence base consists partly of comments from the community either in support of proposed designation or not. Designation would not affect how the space is used.

61	CAM CF2 Local green spaces. especially LGS 55, LGS 10	As children living at Sandpits more than 60 years ago, Holywell Orchard and the Riverside at Everlands were our natural playgrounds. Throughout my life, living in Cam, I have utilised these areas to walk my dogs, as walkways through to Cam village and of late, routes to run, as I endeavour to maintain my fitness. I fully endorse the application that these two sites in particular should be nominated as Green spaces to pass on to future generations for their enjoyment.	To make the Hollywell Orchard and the Riverside land at Cam, Local Green Spaces. I endorse the plan to maintain as much green space as possible in Cam to allow future generations access to play and leisure areas.	Noted, this comment is incorporated in LGS Report
62	Local Green Space	Our house backs onto the River Cam and the green space between St Georges Close and Everlands. It is a beautiful area, full of large old trees and therefore many different varieties of birds including little egret, heron, kingfisher, great spotted and green woodpecker, nuthatch - to name but a few. Also, many different types of owl are heard. We also observe a fair amount of mammals including roe deer, muntjac, foxes, grey squirrels and also otters. All this beautiful, and increasingly rare, wildlife would be lost if this green area were to be developed in any way. One of the main reasons for moving into my house 30 years ago was this green space it backs onto and the abundance of wildlife it encourages. Leave the above area as is so that the residents, as well as future generations, can enjoy the nature on their doorstep. There is so much development countryside, surely one little pocket can be left to thrive.	N/A	Noted, this comment is incorporated in LGS Report
63	Local Green Space	Speaking as firm supporters of LGS for Everlands 'Riverside', not only does this site provide habitat for native flora and fauna it is a tranquil space. We have read in some detail the objections posed by the landowners, and spokespeople on behalf of the landowners, who at face value have dismissed this space as not meeting the criteria. They are wrong. It may not be pretty, but is a much valued and needed space for health and wellbeing and in keeping with the rural nature of this community.	Necessity for green space whilst meeting demand for development. A fine balance must be struck to avoid Cam losing its rural identity. Implementation on the plan that has been proposed	Noted, this comment is incorporated in LGS Report
64	General	I have no issue with the anything written in the document, it sums up the area, the people and the values that they hold well. Due to the type of person that would choose to live in the Cam (family's and retired) we do not feel that a large amount of additional housing is required. Without the addition of local jobs through new industry moving into the area we are unlikely to attract younger people to stay / move into the area to fill the large number of additional houses. The green spaces are incredibly important to the area. The reason many of us choose to live in a village like Cam was the green spaces and the close links to the countryside and wildlife that come with them.		Noted with thanks
65	General	I HAVE ATTENDED CONSULTATION EVENTS AND READ THE PLAN AND MADE COMMENTS AT THOSE EVENTS. I DO NOT INTEND TO COMMENT FURTHER IN DETAIL. I AM GENERALLY SUPPORTIVE OF THE PARISH COUNCIL'S POSITION IN THE CONTEXT OF THE STROUD PLAN. I HAVE GRAVE MISGIVINGS ABOUT THE WIDER GLOUCESTERSHIRE PICTURE IN RELATION TO CRUCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE ISSUES THAT HAVE BEEN REPEATEDLY IDENTIFIED IN LOCAL PLANS, PARTICULARLY THE INABILITY OF THE LOCAL ROAD SYSTEM TO COPE WITH INCREASED HOUSING. I AM ALSO UNSURE AS TO THE LONGER TERM COMPATIBILITY OF THE LOCAL PLANS WITH THE GLOUCESTERSHIRE 2050 VISION DEVELOPING AT COUNTY LEVEL. SEE ABOVE. I'M TOO OLD TO BE DIRECTLY CONCERNED WITH MUCH OF THE FUTURE BUT I HOPE THAT SLAVISH ADHERENCE TO CENTRALLY/POLITICALLY DRIVEN TARGETS ON POPULATION GROWTH AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT WILL NOT DESTROY A LOVELY AREA, THAT HAS MANAGED TO DEVELOP WITHIN ITS GEOGRAPHY PRETTY WELL. I COMMEND THE EFFORTS OF CAM PARISH COUNCIL TO SEEK A BALANCE - A SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY IN A NATURAL GREEN ENVIRONMENT WITH SPACE FOR PEOPLE TO LIVE, WORK AND PLAY.		Noted

66	Littlecombe meadow	Affecting our drainage and countryside views . Losing our lovely green spaces	None, keep our green spaces. Look for land further afield	Noted
67	General	A very pro-active plan for future Cam	The Green Infrastructure emphasis. Make sure that all future development is based on, and follows the Protocols of this NDP	Noted
68	NDP/LGS - Everlands 'Riverside'	We would like to further add that the mature trees that 'screen' this site, and give Everlands its unique character and appearance, are beautiful in their own right and therefore need protecting. It's interesting that the only objectors for this site being designated a LGS are the landowners. I wonder why..		Noted, the comment regarding trees is incorporated in LGS Report
69	General	Very in depth research and conclusions	In general all. Make sure it is used in the decision making for the future of Cam	Noted with thanks
70	General	It looks very good. The green inifrastructure e.g. the green open spaces and trees. If this plan is followed Cam would be a good place to live and work in		Noted with thanks
71	011;014;015;016	We have lived here for 24 years so can attest that we find Cam a very pleasant place in which to have our home. The overall plan seems very comprehensive and I am very pleased to see the emphasis on keeping Cam an attractive rural village in which to live even though there will be over the years a much larger population due to the increase in housing that is planned. Planning to make the area around Tesco's feel more of a village centre seems important.		Noted with thanks
72	General	As someone who enjoys the natural world I am very pleased to see the aim of keeping our green spaces and corridors and enhancing the diversity of the area through the proposal to map and protect the local trees and have a tree warden, looking after the snickets and the green corridors within the parish boundaries and developing the Greenway through to Ulay.		Noted
73	General	I also think it important to encourage small businesses into Cam so that it doesn't become mainly a village of commuters.		Noted
74	General	However the railway station is obviously very important for those working away from Cam and there needs to be a better bus service to the station.		Noted
75	General	Also it is important for there to be continued input from the council to influence the nature of the housing and commercial development in the area.		Noted
76	CAMCF1	I note that under key community facilities the chemist is not included. I understand that this is a retail business and Boots are under no obligation to stay in Cam but I think given the number of elderly people in the village some sort of pharmacy provision should be maintained if they were to close - perhaps council help to include one in the Orchard Medical Centre.		This facility cannot be included in the CAMCF1 as it is a retail operation operating under Class A1 of the Use Classes Order. The chemist facility could be lost through the premises becoming a different retail business, and the planning policy cannot protect against this.
77	General, Projects	I have not studied the plan in depth but can't recall seeing the problems arising from climate change being specifically addressed. This will be important to realise the aim of Cam being a good place to live in in the future. Is pressure put on developers to incorporate energy efficient measures in their housing schemes for instance. However I do note that in the project list Section 3 does talk about working to encourage use of public transport and making people aware of shortcuts available when walking around the parish.		Noted - this comment is addressed specifically in the next draft of the plan (see 'Addressing Climate Change in the Cam Parish Neighbourhood Plan') and should continue to influence future revisions

78	General	The NDP has been generated from the energy, knowledge and passion of a group of local volunteers supported by Cam Parish Council. Vision and commitment from all will be needed at a time of such uncertainty and threat from Brexit, Climate Emergency and Biodiversity Emergency. An ageing demographic brings a raft of future challenges, many still awaiting clear national government leadership. Community must be empowered to do more through the policy frameworks set out in the Neighbourhood Development Plan.		Noted - this comment is address specifically in the next draft of the plan (see 'Addressing Climate Change in the Cam Parish Neighbourhood Plan') and shoud continue to influence future revisions
79	P58/59	Cammunity projects set out on pages 58/59 are a great starter for our futures. To have a vibrant future Cammunity must work for it. The Parish Council is uniquely placed to be both the driver and agent for positive long term change in the Parish.		Noted with thanks
80	CAMCF2	I am heartened by the accurate descriptions of the cultural, natural environment, built environment, historical and economic context for the Parish of Cam. Our Parish is special and deserves protection from bland, destructive and careless local development. Policy CAMCF2 and the 10 Local Green Spaces chosen must be secured. Cam still has some ecological connectivity overall and strong connectivity for those sites lying close the river's course.		Noted
81	General	Cam is still a green Parish relatively rich in green features of both cultural and ecological importance. These spaces must be protected and conserved. DEFRA's 25 year plan for nature and recent statements from the Chair of Natural England concerning support for Nature's Recovery give a rock solid basis for the future. We support the ideas, proposals and policies set out in this document and look forward to our future lives being enriched by it in this wonderful Parish of Cam.		Noted with thanks
82	CAMCD4	The pre-application engagement - is that seperate to the Council's pre-application advice? How many people are doing that?		Yes. The protocol adopted by Parish Council puts in place procedures for applicants to engage with the community of Cam early enough to postively shape proposals. It is encouraged as best practice not required. Cam Parish does see pre-application engagement and hopes to see more in the future.
83	Fig 14 and Green Infrastructure	The protection of the allotments (although you have shown Ashmead 2 on figure 14 as much larger than it actually is.		Allotments are protected by policy CAMCF1, and are detailed in the Green Infrastructure evidence base. The size of Ashmead 2 has been checked and amended accordingly.
84	General	I think the younger community need to be thought about! We're allowing development in back gardens (I know SDC's Local Plan doesn't stop this) but I think more needs to be done to make it harder both through the NDP and the parish council as not all young people want to live in these "rabbit hutches" that they call houses		Noted
85	General	all looks very good, all the green spaces and playing fields. if this works it will be great	nothing of any significance	Noted with thanks
86	Page 48 policy CamCF2. Page 40 Cam Greenway	We strongly support the designation of the Local Green Spaces proposed In the plan and the Cam, Uley and Dursley greenway. Apologies but did not have enough time to read thoroughly		Noted
87	General	Agree		Noted

88	General	<p>The consideration of a range of elements that contribute towards a healthy and sustainable life style...Providing the amenities to enable and encourage people to travel via means other than car both increases community cohesiveness as well as reducing air and noise pollution, however care needs to be taken that where multi user routes are created users recognise them as a shared amenity and don't see it as a provision to solely meet their needs. In a similar vein, whilst as rural a feel as possible needs to be maintained as well as optimising the biodiversity along such routes, consideration needs to be made to the less mobile user (particularly given the % of senior citizens in the area) e.g. avoid the use of stiles, only put in barriers where necessary e.g. safety or stock and where possible consider the needs of those in 'trampers'.</p> <p>The focus of the plan to maintain a 'community' is key to the mental and physical wellbeing of those that live in Cam and so a diversity of land use, minimising the need to travel by car and creating an attractive environment will be key. Ensuring that the biodiversity is optimised in all development, that trees are kept and numbers increased, that hedges are retained and that corridors are maintained/created to enable wildlife to move around easily. Ensuring the needs of wildlife are fully incorporated into buildings e.g. use of swift bricks, hedgehog runs, build in nesting areas into house eaves for birds and bats. Where greenspace exists design/manage it to support all the needs of the community e.g. safe play areas, areas for quiet relaxation, dog walking, wildlife, informal and formal exercise etc.</p>		Noted
89	Transport	Road infrastructure and public transport services to cater for increased traffic and people travelling must be in place before any further development takes place. As current road infrastructure in not coping with current developments at peak times.	All. There must be local employment.	Highways issues are outside the scope of this plan
90	General	No individual comments.	I agree with all aspects of the plan. There is nothing with which I disagree. I should like to see the plan fully implemented.	Noted
91	General	<p>I support the proposal. There appears to be no guarantee that the proposals will be adhered to at a future date so I can only wish Cam Parish Council luck in being able to control this proposed expansion.</p> <p>All the policies to support and maintain the essence of this area which appear to be covered throughout: the green infrastructure and biodiversity, locally valued views are kept, trees, woodland and hedgerows, local green spaces designate. Recognising that any development takes into consideration the objectives of AONB and that the design of houses considers the environment and sustainability.</p>		Noted with thanks. The Cam NDP will be in general conformity with the Stroud Local Plan and does not seek to block strategic development, but rather to positively shape it.
92	General	The NDP appears to be a good way forward for cam Consider the impact on the already busy area	The green infrastructure. Make sure that the NDP is use by all these planing the furniture of cam	Noted with thanks
93	Green spaces, AONB	As a resident of Cam it's very important to me that cam retains its character as a rural village. Our green recreational spaces & AONB need to be protected from development & also where development does occur needs to be in keeping with the area & suitable infrastructure (roads, transport routes) included in the development.	Improved transport links & roads.	Noted

94	Green spaces and traffic in the area	The amount of green spaces in Dursley and Cam have already been reduced by new estates being built in different areas throughout the area. No thought has gone into the parking or traffic implications for these houses, in many places congestion is caused by traffic parking both sides of an estate with no pull in spaces for traffic and the road is a main route in and out of town.	Loss of green spaces, additional traffic near an already very busy primary school and church.	Noted
95	General	We think the plan has been thoughtfully and sympathetically put together and gives a very promising and positive outlook for the community of Cam. We are very lucky to be nestled between AONB and the green spaces dotted in between should be preserved. Cam sports ground, for example is a prime example of this. We need to treasure and celebrate these spaces, and the neighborhood planning group should be applauded for recognising this and the value it brings to each and every one of us.		Noted with thanks
96	Local Green Spaces	The LGS areas as indicated in Figure 15 should all be kept as GREEN SPACES. LGS8, LGS9, and LGS10 are the nearest to all of the Littlecombe Development residents, and are natural wildlife habitats, unspoilt. They are accessible to everyone with public footpaths and well used. All of the LGS areas should be left as they are, i.e. not swallowed into residential development, amidst all the current, and large proposed developments within the Cam Parish Area. It would be seen as sacrilege not to preserve them.		Noted, this comment is incorporated in LGS Report
97	General	I enjoyed reading the NDP and whilst I oppose such large scale development in Cam, I hope that this NDP will force developers to build houses which are more in keeping with the character of Cam. I agree with the NDP in full and having read it through it made me realise that Cam is a very pleasant place to live. I agree with the NDP's Vision and Objectives for Cam and especially interested in ensuring that we retain our green infrastructure and Local Green Spaces. As a keen runner, I have used many of the Local Green Spaces and snickets throughout Cam. As an Upper Cam resident, I also use Littlecombe Meadow and Street Farm Field to walk to Dursley enjoying the green fields rather than busy roads. With the opening up of the Littlecombe estate, I am now able to walk to Dursley and enjoy the River Cam valley. It is really important that all new development has sufficient green open spaces to attract wildlife and provide play space including an obligation to plant trees. I also like the idea of a greenway which encourages people to walk and cycle.		Noted with thanks
98	Local green spaces LGS8 (Littlecombe Meadow) and LGS9 (Street Farm Field).	I feel that both LGS8 (Littlecombe Meadow) and LGS9 (Street Farm Field) are excellent proposals as local green spaces as they are adjacent to the large housing development of Littlecombe (where I live) and provide an abundant source of birdlife, wildlife (eg foxes), hedgerow and wildflowers for residents to enjoy. The footpaths through these green areas allow many people to enjoy all these things within these spaces. The areas also provide a sensible buffer between the built up nature of Littlecombe and the village character of Upper Cam.	I agree with LGS8 (Littlecombe Meadow) and LGS9 (Street Farm Field) being designated as local green spaces.	Noted, this comment is incorporated in LGS Report
99	General	As I am a member of the NDP Steering Group, I agree with the NDP in its entirety. Like many parishioners, I am very much opposed with the large scale development envisaged for Cam because we do not have sufficient infrastructure in place. I am appalled by the recent development in Cam which is of poor design, lacking green spaces with a total disregard to the needs of wildlife, eg ripping out hedgerows in Box Road. The setting of Cam is beautiful and I like how the NDP recognises Cam's attributes with its Vision and Objectives. I fully support all of the nominated Local Green Spaces and regularly use Littlecombe Meadow and Street Farm Field in Upper Cam when walking to Dursley or taking my grandchildren to the park on Littlecombe.	I do not disagree with any items in the NDP. I propose that all the items included in the NDP are agreed to ensure that future development is more in keeping with the character of Cam.	Noted

100	Page 17 Figure 5 and page 49 Green space plan.	Page 17 Figure 5 Cam Plan Strategy Overview map indicates that the Local Green Space extends to the back of the property that abuts Springhill (incorporating the small allotment area). However, the plan on page 49 referenced LGS8 does not encompass the allotment area, which we consider should be designated a Green Space please, and so be reflected in the Figure 5 areas as well. We support the establishment of Green spaces to be protected.	Please incorporate the area of the allotment within the Green space allocation as noted above.	Figure 5 has been amended to ensure consistency between the Local Green Space map and the Overall Strategy Map. The allotment area to the north has not been included as part of the Local Green Space consultation and so is not included in the proposed Local Green Space designation
101	I would like to comment on LGS 8 Littlecombe Meadow & LGS9 Street Farm Field	These two attractive green spaces(LGS 8&9) provide an important divide between the older village areas of Cam and the new development of Littlecombe where I live. Both these green spaces support a huge amount of flora and fauna and are an absolute delight to walk through, which we do on a daily basis, as do many others living on the Littlecombe development and beyond. I feel that both these areas should be protected for future generations to enjoy and not built on.	I agree that LGS 8&9 should be designated as green spaces. "Both these green spaces support a huge amount of flora and fauna and are an absolute delight to walk through, which we do on a daily basis. I feel that both these areas should be protected for future generations to enjoy and not built on."	Noted, this comment is incorporated in LGS Report
102	General	I support the importance of maintaining green spaces and wildlife corridors. Thanks to the steering group for producing a clear and comprehensive document.		Noted with thanks
103	General	Transport links should be improved including review of train service including to the north of Cam. Currently the earliest train to Gloucester is too late for many potential commuters. Any development should provide sufficient car parking areas.		Noted but this comment is outside the scope of the NDP.
104	LGS8 & LGS9	These are references to sites identified in the development plan, LGS report. I have responded to the Stroud District Planners about the green space in upper Cam during the recent Public Consultation. I wish to simply reiterate them for the benefit of the local council. It is important to have some separation between Dursley and Cam and to retain the local character... The land at Street Farm and the adjacent Littlecombe Meadow need to be retained as green space. My full reasons have been to SDC.		Noted, this comment is incorporated in LGS Report
105	Page 11 Vision 1st paragraph	In February 2017 the Parish Council leisure committee agree a report which proposed improving links to the countryside to enable access for all in the interests of local residents health and well being. The sentence on links to the countryside is not ambitious enough.	The vision should be strengthened to make the most of the settlements links with the surrounding countryside and should refer to improvements to the footpath network to enable better access for the less able in the interest of health and wellbeing.	Noted - this point has been added to the vision
106	Objectives O1	This objective should be ammended to show that it embraces improved access for the less able.	This objective could refer to "people who are less able" (or "people who have mobility difficulties").	Noted - objective amended
107	Page 12 Objective O9	The term "strengthen" is difficult to understand. Is this different to "improve" in objective O8? It is an opportunity to reinforce that the PC wants to promote better access for the less able.	Clearer form of words needed. Include reference to "access for the less able".	Noted - objective amended

108	Page 23 GI assets map	This plan purports to show "key strategic GI assets", as stated in the explanation paragraph 2, to flesh out Stroud Local Plan policies, but the relevant local plan policies do not refer to footpaths. The choice of footpath loops appears to be a little arbitrary and does not follow the evidence base which claims to include the Lantern Way as loop 4. Loop 4 on the Assets Map includes only one small section of the Lantern Way. In any event, Loop 4 as shown surely cannot be described as Strategic. The footpath loops seem to be based merely on found guided local paths. (probably from the Dursley Welcomes Walkers website). However, there are other guided routes (several starting from the station) that encourage walks through to other neighbouring Parishes that are not mentioned, and the real Lantern Way and Dursley Figure of Eight routes, which are perhaps more strategic, are also not included. In addition, there is no mention of other equally important path routes to the south linking the settlement to Stinchcombe Hill and the Cotswold Way! No doubt, over time, other guided footpath routes will be developed. There is a danger that selecting one or two paths as 'strategic' detracts from the importance of the PROW network as a whole and could undermine efforts to make improvements to other parts of the network. It is one of the benefits of living in Cam to have a choice and variety of walking routes. Only one of the approved Kissing Gate routes has been included presumably because it is linking to Cam Peak, but implementation of all the kissing gates proposed is important to create a basic network of routes accessible to the less able.	Amend the approach to paths so that all PROW are considered to be of equal importance as Green Infrastructure assets. Show all the outstanding Kissing Gate proposal on the Assets Map to enable a network of accessible paths to be promoted and funded by the PC and/or Development proposals.	Agreed. Figure 7 and accompanying Green Infrastructure Report amended.
109	Page 41 Policy CAMMC1	This policy makes reference to Development contributing to enhanced links to the wider countryside, but does not refer to the need to make such links more accessible through the provision of gaps and kissing gates rather than stiles.	Amend the policy to make it clear that the provision of enhanced footpaths should include the replacement of existing stiles with gaps or kissing gates to improve access for the less able.	Policy amended, replacement of existing stiles is covered in Section 6 (Projects) of the NDP and more detail is in the Green Infrastructure Report.
110	Local Green Space	Cam Sports Ground, Everlands-is an important easily accessible green space well used regularly by local sports clubs and informally by local people to exercise and enjoy. Annual events held here are enjoyed by many. Street Farm Field, Upper Cam-is an important green space between Upper Cam and the new development at Littlecombe allowing wildlife to thrive in an area where nearby fields have been built on in recent years. It allows for continuing separate identity of Upper Cam with its particularly attractive historical character.		Noted, this comment is incorporated in LGS Report
111	Page 1 General	Great cover sheet with Community header/strapline and Cam Peak/Longdown graphic. The whole publication looks highly professional and suggests that considerable thought and effort has gone into its production.		Noted with thanks

112	Section 4	Policies for walking, cycling and public transport is fine (and to be encouraged), but the plan doesn't appear to say much about the increased traffic generated by new development-should there not be a policy in the plan to stipulate requirements on developers to mitigate its effect on the well being of Cam residents (eg pay toward road improvements/parking facilities etc)? If housing development has to take place in the parish, the land identified to the north east of Cam does acknowledge the need for it to be located close to existing transport infrastructure such as the railway and the A38/M5, and if the development has to be attached to Cam then this would seem to be the least worst place for it to be, both due to the topography of the land surrounding the existing settlement and the likelihood that many of the new inhabitants will commute in the direction of Bristol and Gloucester. However I see future traffic as a major downside from such development in the Cam area. To the north of the main development areas at Box Road/Draycott, road capacity is constrained by the existing bridges over the railway and the M5, whilst to the south, the linear corridor through Cam and Dursley (effectively constrained by the surrounding topography) provides little scope for significant improvements to transport infrastructure to cope with the an inevitable increase in traffic. Despite the wish to encourage alternative forms of transport, I believe the use of cars (electric or otherwise in the years ahead) merits greater mention in the plan, given the fairly rural nature of Cam's location and hence the limitations of other forms of transport. Increased traffic through Cam and Dursley, coupled with greater demand for parking, is liable to have a negative impact on Cam, and the provision of adequate parking facilities within new estates and adjacent to village facilities needs to be a requirement for new developments/streetscape improvements. The parked cars that blight the Lister Street area in Dursley (due to inadequate off-street parking) are an example of how not to plan new development. Parking must also remain free if people are to be encouraged to use local facilities/rail transport.	Review policies in the Neighbourhood Plan to perhaps include requirements on developers to mitigate the effect of increases traffic on the wellbeing of Cam residents (eg pay towards road improvements/parking facilities etc).	Mitigation of the impact of increased traffic as a result of new development will be dealt with as part of any planning application.
113	Page 24	I strongly agree with the need to protect the <u>setting</u> of the AONB. Development of the land above the 50m contour between fields to the north of Upthorpe and the AONB would be highly detrimental to views from many locations in the Cam area. I note the "structural landscaping buffer" below the 50m contour requirement for the NE Cam development (page 14 of the document), and hope this requirement is driven by the accepted need for development not to encroach on higher elevations.		Noted
114	Page 49	I also agree with the green spaces identified, which I consider vital to preserving the character of Cam and habitat for wildlife. I consider the preservation of the riverside land at Everlands, Street Farm Field, Littlecombe Meadow, Hollywell Orchard and Cam Sports Ground of particular importance, so as to preserve the village feel of Upper Cam and the character of the wider area as a whole.		Noted
115	LGS	For the local football club, local resident!		Noted
116	LGS	One of the last remaining green spaces.		Noted
117	LGS	Green space essential for youth sports development.		Noted
118	LGS Report	Keep Cam Rec (Sports Field) as green space.		Noted
119	LGS Report	Need green space. Used community for a long time.		Noted
120	General	Without green space where do children and adults play sport and do recreation? Its vital.		Noted

121	General	I agree with the plan because I want to save all the Local Green Spaces in Upper Cam. In particular Street Farm Field and Littlecombe Meadow should not be built on. All of the countryside around Upper Cam should be protected.		Noted
122	21, LGS	Cam Sports Ground used by walkers, cricket, football, tennis players, children playing, dog walking, good views of surrounding area. Must be retained as a sports ground.		Noted
123	LGS Report	Something the local area really needs to keep.		Noted
124	LGS Report	Local Sports Clubs on site vitally important it remains a sports club and facility.		Noted
125	LGS Report	Lack of green space in the area accessible to the community.		Noted
126	LGS Report	Areas used a lot by the community.		Noted
127	LGS Report	Sports club crucial to local area.		Noted
128	LGS Report	Lack of green space in Cam area. I want to keep the recreation field as an area for sports and public use.		Noted
129	P.26	Consider also views towards important features of the area. Limit building of houses on rising land towards particularly Cam Peak as this would destroy the iconic view of this landmark from virtually the whole area. (The land I would least like developed is at Cam Green-presently as a potential site).	Choose land on flatter areas eg PS22, PS24, PS37	Noted. The higher areas of the Parish, towards Cam Peak are the more sensitive. Policy CAMES2 addresses this.
130	General	I would like SDC to accept the Cam Neighbourhood Plan.	I have seen the Cam Neighbourhood Plan and I believe it is the right option for residents of Cam.	Noted with thanks
131	LGS	Lived in Cam for 9 years and have seen many changes. Many green fields have disappeared for houses being built so we must keep our green spaces that's left for people and wildlife to enjoy for the future. B Minns		Noted
132	LGS	I have already commented on the green spaces on the online questionnaire but I think the local green spaces are incredibly important particularly as more and more of Cam is developed. We have to protect the green spaces which exist between the different areas of Cam and Dursley otherwise we risk becoming like places such as Yate/Chipping Sodbury.		Noted
133	Draft Local Green Space Report P24-P25	Street Farm-Support proposal. Important as part of green space between Cam and Dursley. Important for walkers and wildlife	Definitely make it a designated Local Green Space.	Noted, this comment is incorporated in LGS Report
134	Draft Local Green Space Report P24-P25	Street Farm-Support proposal as will form important green space separating Upper Cam from Dursley. Important recreational area for walkers with and without dogs and good for wildlife-badgers, deer etc often seen.	Make it a designated local green space-it always used to be agricultural land!	Noted, this comment is incorporated in LGS Report
135	LGS7, LGS8, LGS9, LGS10	In general ...we are delighted to see these as designated green spaces. They protect the heart of Old Cam...we would advocate at all costs these are retained as present and future community assets.		Noted, this comment is incorporated in LGS Report
136	General	Rather than comment on each part of the plan by page I would like to make points which concern me below and perhaps could be in the plan, if not already in.		
137		1. Need more children's play areas as part of the central hub. Opportunity missed with the redevelopment next to Tesco store.		Noted - improvement to the centre of Cam are explored further in the Cam Village Framework Discussion Document which is included in the evidence base to the Plan.

138		2. Maximise pedestrian access at intersection of Cam Pitch and High Street. Perhaps replace the roundabout with a design (Oxford Circus in London)? that allows freer access across the junction for pedestrians. This may hold up traffic longer but drivers are mostly in warm comfortable seats!		Noted - improvement to the centre of Cam are explored further in the Cam Village Framework Discussion Document which is included in the evidence base to the Plan.
139		3. Improve Box Road A4135 junction. Mini roundabout?		Noted - improvement to the centre of Cam are explored further in the Cam Village Framework Discussion Document which is included in the evidence base to the Plan.
140		4. Make car park at Cam and Dursley Station larger. By the way, i used to use the bus service but its too infrequent and not synchronised with the trains.		Noted but these comments are outside the scope of the Plan
141		5. Happy with plans to improve cycling and pedestrian routes.		Noted with thanks
142		6. Congratulations on producing a good and comprehensive plan. Look forward to reaping the benefits,		Noted with thanks
143	Pp 48-49	Local Green Space 8 Littlecombe Meadow, We agree that this must be maintained as a Green Space and not developed . When the Littlecombe development was first planned we were given a promise that there would remain a gap between the development and Upper Cam, so that Upper Cam retained its village character and was not swallowed up. The space is also very valuable as a recreational place for dog walking etc. and as a wildlife corridor away from block paving etc.		Noted, this comment is incorporated in LGS Report.
144	General	This plan is very positive and needs to be adopted to preserve the Cam area that we know and love. It is important to keep as much green space , trees hedges as possible. Please take notice of this plan.		Noted with thanks
145	General	I am fully supportive of the Cam Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan 2019-2031 and pleased to see that the local district will be adopting the policies presented.		Noted with thanks
146	General	The Cam Neighbourhood Development Plan is a fantastic document. I totally agree with the protectio of Cam's unique character and beauty. As a long tern resident I have been dismayed by the changes already made.		Noted with thanks
147	General	I have read the draft and agree and accept the contents of all the Local Green Spaces that have been put forward in the NDP. Keep our green spaces please.		Noted
148	General	When needing new housing development there needs to be a mixture of bungalows and flats.		Noted, but the mix of development is outside the scope of the Plan
149	Page 23, building with nature	The key points in this green infrastructure map are BIG to keep Cam in touch with nature. Green Space, outdoor play spaces for children and adults.		Noted
150	P49	LGS7- Lots of local elderly people use this space as it is accessible on scooters and wheelchairs. Also well used by children and sports. Support it being a ope green space. There is nowhere else between the centre of Cam that is green space.		Noted, this comment is incorporated in LGS Report
151	General	I would like to congratulate the team for the work they have done and for the clarity of the proposals. I am happy to support the plan in its entirety.		Noted with thanks
152	LGS	I am very concerned about the local green spaces being built on. These spaces even small are very important to everyone. Dog walkers, children etc. But for older people who are unable to walk or travel out of Cam this is their only means of seeing wildlife etc. There are many children and others who live in flats that have no gardens.	Stop any building on these spaces.	Noted
153	General	No problems that I can see.		Noted
154	General - community facilities / projects?	Requires better access to Jubilee playing fields and better play equipment for young children ie slides, swings, zip wires etc. Feel the park is geared towards older children.		Noted

155	App. 3, Code 4c, Page 29	All bus shelters should be the nice yellow stone ones not the horrible plastic green ones	Bus stops along new development like Box Road should be yellow stone.	Noted. Comment added within the Code
156	General	I appreciate the hard work put into the book that I read at the meeting, yes the comments for the future were fine, but personally I cannot see it happening! Cam will not be a village in the future, we are losing green fields at the present time, we are inundated with huge sites of 4-5 bedroom houses, no bungalows for the elderly! Not enough parking spaces hence the roads are full of cars now. Whatever will be like with a further 1500? i dread to think!		Noted
157	pp58/59 Projects	Relating to the development of a strategy to "Encourage better access to and increased use of public transport" and "I mprove links within the existing built-up area for cycling and bus provision", I fully support this and would hope that consideration has been made as to improving public transport links to nearby towns, for example Gloucester, with the aim of reducing private transport. Currently getting buses as a commuter is not feasible from parts of Cam. This would also hopefully reduce traffic in and around Cam itself.		Noted
158	p39 Cam and Dursley Train Station	Please ensure that free parking is maintained at the train station. I do not tend to park there (I cycle if taking the train) but I appreciate the free parking within Cam and Dursley (e.g. at the Council Buildings and Long Street). Free parking adds to the sense of community and gives a sense of civility. I am sure that those who drive to the train station really appreciate not being burdened by a charge.		This is outside the scope of this Plan
159	Pp48-49	Local Green Space 9 (Street Farm Field): We agree that this must be maintained as a Green Space and not developed. When the e agree that this must be maintained as a Green Space and not developed. When the Littlecombe development was first planned we were given a promise that there would remain a gap between this development and Upper Cam, so that Upper Cam retained its village character and was not swallowed up. The space is also very valuable as a recreational place for dog walking etc. and as a wildlife corridor away from block paving etc.		Noted, this comment is incorporated in LGS Report
160	Pp48-49	Local Green Space 10 Riverside land at Everlands. We agree that this must be maintained as a Green Space and not developed; it could be also utilised to allow the cycle way to avoid some of the road section along Everlands. The space is also very valuable as a recreational place for dog walking etc. and as a wildlife area, given that many of the long gardens on Everlands have now been built on.		Noted, this comment is incorporated in LGS Report
161	General	The Cam Sports Field at Everlands provides sports facilities to three different clubs with countless members if you include the youth clubs. If simply can't be built on, it would have a massive negative impact on the local community.		Noted
162	Appendix 8 Local Green Spaces	I support completely all the areas listed for the allocation as local green space. They are very important for our wildlife etc.		Noted
163	Appendix 8 Local Green Spaces	I believe that it is important to protect our green spaces and I feel that all the areas listed should be designated as local green space		Noted
164	General	I am a member of the Cam Football club and feel that Cam Sports Field in Everlands is a valued green space and allows sports to be played within walking distance and my children also enjoy playing there as they feel safe and it is a great area for them to enjoy.		Noted

165	General	<p>Dear Colleague, Re: Pre-submission consultation on Cam Neighbourhood Plan (CNDP)</p> <p>Thank you for giving Stroud District Council the opportunity to comment on the contents of your draft neighbourhood plan. The draft CNDP contains much to commend it and it is clear that considerable research has been undertaken to prepare the plan for this community. To fulfil our duty to guide and assist, required by paragraph 3 of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), the Council has endeavoured to identify whether the policies and supporting text in the CNDP pre-submission consultation draft have been worded clearly, concisely and positively and whether they have been based on robust evidence, clearly structured and of additional value to the existing policy framework.</p> <p>To communicate our response in a simple, constructive and positive manner; we have produced a table containing an identification number for each comment, a reference to the relevant section/policy of the NDP, our comments and, where possible, a recommendation.</p>		Noted with thanks
166	P21, Policy CAMES1	This policy is overly complicated, making it difficult to interpret in the decision making process, and contains requirements contrary to local and national policy i.e the use of the term "required to" and "will be refused". Text referring to tests laid out in the NPPF and mitigation could be included in the supporting text We feel you need to clarify the relationship between this policy (and policy CAMCD2) and Figures 6 and 7 so that it is clear which policies refer to which assets.	The policy text could be made much simpler e.g. "Development adjacent to, or containing identified green infrastructure corridors (Figure 7) should protect and, where feasible, improve and extend the network. Development in other locations should look to extend the network where feasible". Link policy wording to specific figures to make clear the assets you are referring to in each policy.	Policy wording amended accordingly
167	P23, Figure 7	4The Jubilee Field notation appears to be in the wrong place.	Amend notation on Figure 7.	Figure 7 amended accordingly
168	P24, Policy CAMES2	Replace "permitted" with "supported" in first paragraph. Delete the second paragraph as it says much the same thing as the first.	See comment	Policy wording amended accordingly
169	4 P25, Figure 8	This map doesn't seem to be referenced in any policy or supporting text but could usefully be referred to in an amended ES2 or ES3 if you feel topography is an important criteria for managing development. (For example, the Local Plan seeks to limit development on site SA3 to below the 50m contour.	See comment.	Policy wording amended accordingly
170	P26 Policy CAMES3	Requirements for submission of LVIA are determined by the local planning authority and would only be required by development deemed to potentially have a significant environmental impact, not all development proposals. The policy as a whole could be simplified to improve ease of interpretation. This could be achieved by splitting the policy into 2 parts: part 1 dealing with landscape and tying into the design code, and part 2 referring to the identified valued views in figure 9.	Review wording.	The policy will be split into 2; now CAMES2 Parish Landscape Character and CAMES3 Valued Views.
171	P29 (also in Vision	The first sentence refers to "exemplary 'garden village' qualities". If this is quoted from a study or the evidence base then the source should be included.	Review wording.	Wording amended
172	P31 Policy CAMCD1	This policy should be used as the main "hook" into the Design Code. The 3 paragraphs of the policy overlap in their content and could be simplified to create a clearer and more coherent design policy, underpinned by the design code	Review wording.	Agreed. Policy wording amended accordingly

173	P34 Policy CAMCD2	Again this policy could be more concise and easier for planners to interpret. Mechanisms for the requirement for tree surveys are already in place and unnecessary in this policy. BS5837 standards also set out requirements for the survey so there is no point in adding to this with requirements to tag trees etc. The required tree loss mitigation ratio can be an aspiration (or means for supporting applications) but not a requirement as only one can technically be a replacement.. Tying in the policy to Figure 11 would be beneficial.	Review wording.	Agreed. Policy wording amended accordingly
174	P38, Policy CAMCD4	Simplify the text and mention the fact that the Protocol is in Appendix 2. Remove the second paragraph and place in the supporting text	Review wording e.g. "Development proposals should follow the Pre-Application Engagement Protocol (see Appendix 2)"	Agreed. Policy wording amended accordingly
175	P41, Policy CAMMC1	The principle of the policy is fine but the wording needs to be tidied up to become clearer in its distinctions between the various rights of way, how they are integrated, improved or enhanced through development, and what they should connect to. The definition of a 'snicket' needs to be consistent. They are variously referred to as 'enhanced footpaths', 'segregated non-vehicular routes', and 'local greenways' in the policy and supporting text.	Review wording.	Agreed. Policy and supporting text wording amended accordingly
176	P45, Policy CAMCF1	The second part of this policy referring to support for new community facilities could be open to interpretation and needs more definition as to what constitutes a community facility, and whether there is a specific community facility that is lacking, and would therefore be supported. There is no mechanism in the policy for the support of a development that provides a replacement/enhanced facility as mitigation against the loss of those listed.	Review wording.	Policy and supporting text wording amended accordingly. Supporting text to include definition of 'Community Facilities' (taken from the Stroud Local Plan glossary).
177	P50, para 3	Review the second sentence of this paragraph to make it clear that the District Centre status is part of the current Local Plan.	Review wording.	Wording amended
178	P52, Policy CAME2	In the last sentence it is suggested that "will be expected to" is replaced with "should", and "proportionate and appropriate information" is replaced with "evidence".	Review wording.	Policy wording amended accordingly
179	P53, Introduction	The first paragraph is slightly confusing in that the claim of a 'Village Centre' quality of place in the first sentence is immediately contradicted by the second sentence. If the 'Village Centre' quality is taken from a piece of evidence, then this needs to be cited. If not, then it needs to perhaps clarify that the uses and landmarks have the potential to enhance the quality of place in the centre	Review wording.	Wording amended
180	Appendix 3, Cam Design Code	Some of the wording to the individual codes needs to be reviewed to ensure the language presents a piece of design guidance, rather than a prescriptive set of rules i.e. replace "must" with "should". As mentioned in the above comment on CAMCD2, additional requirements to a BS5837 tree survey are beyond the scope of an NDP. CAM Code 3a should therefore be reviewed to be less of a procedural requirement, and more of a mechanism to influence design.	Review wording.	Agreed. Some of the wording within the Code will be reviewed in line with this comment

181	General	<p>I am responding to the proposed plans for the green space between Kingsdown estate and Acacia drive being built on for housing!</p> <p>Just as a reminder,there are few green spaces within Dursley,we have the one I have mentioned,then there is the War memorial recreation field at Dursley & also Cam playing field.. Also there is Highfields play area & a green space opp the Cambridge housing estate that is to be demolished for housing (what will happen to the green space there I wonder!!) I truly hope that thinking about tthe few green spaces we have left within Dursley ,that SDC will see fit to persevere them as once they are gone,they are gone forever. Very little will be gained from building on the green space near where I live except perhaps a financial one. As a synopsis regarding this area,we have a lot of wildlife....Foxes,Badgers,Muckjac deer & various varieties of birds,including Blackbird,Wren,bluetits,Thrush,Sparrow,Woodpecker & the list goes on And did I forget Humans who enjoy the peace & space on a daily basis(myself included as I use this space almost daily) If you build on this land or any other green spaces within Dursley & Cam then it is only making people in the long term go elsewhere for walks/time out rather than in the local area which will profit no one</p>		The Cam Neighbourhood Plan does not include any proposed development sites
182	General, Local green spaces	<p>As I am completely against any unnecessary development on non-strategic sites I agree 100% with the proposals within the plan. In 2005 an enquiry into the mixed use development on the "old" Listers site stated that the eastern slopes of the escarpment should remain development free. In 2016 a Planning Inspector dismissed an appeal on land at Street Farm stating "Nevertheless, together with the open space provided for the new development which adjoins it on the western side, it provides a significant and pleasant green wedge or gap separating the older and new housing, contributing to the village-like character of Upper Cam." Many people enjoy this green gap, used daily by dog walkers, ramblers and residents. It also provides an off road public right of way leading to the AONB and surrounding countryside. Therefore Street Farm Field, Littlecombe Meadow and Riverside should be afforded the protection of the local green space designation in Cam's Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p>		Noted
183	Page 1 and page 60	<p>GENERAL Although I am an NDP member of the steering group I have not had a part to play in the actual writing, layout and graphics of the document. I would just like to say that it is well written with short paragraphs to keep the interest and a non-Cam resident will learn a lot by it . The graphics of the Cam Peak and its Longdown first and last page, mostly green `header ` are great.</p>	<p>If I had to make a comment here then window stickers of this would look great !</p>	Noted with thanks
184	Page 10	<p>As has been stated that one third of the population of Cam are pensioners I would argue that there is a bit too much emphasis in the document generally on the greenway for cyclists and pedestrians through Cam to the train station. The greenway is for mostly fit and able bodied people and many pensioners are not. Current pensioners may comment on the fact that their bus service has been cut. The bus service through Upper Cam is poor. We cannot ignore the car and there are more `driving` pensioners on the roads than 20-30 years ago. This is likely to increase if we are living longer (and I hope to be one of them).</p>	<p>A bit more of a mention of the bus service . If the bus service has been cut due to statistics and lack of demand then if we are to keep Cam less blighted with increased traffic currently and from our new developments then the bus service may have to be increased in the future. In an ideal world more small shuttle buses to serve the community and its new developments.</p>	Noted
185	Page 24	<p>The picture on page 24 shows the view that we all know and love. Cam Peak and it's Longdown are unique. Variations on this view can be seen from many of the built up areas of Cam and Dursley and from walking the whole area. It is appreciated by many of us. Whilst the area is AONB from the base upwards, the area including all the fields downwards and forwards is not. Would this view seen by many be spoilt by housing encroaching on it ? Surely I am stating the obvious!</p>	<p>Although the Severn Vale is a beautiful area to look at as a whole from Cam Peak and Longdown, if developments have to happen, then a few hundred (not a few 1000!) houses as a continuation of Cam in the lowland areas blend in better and are not seen by most of the residents of Cam itself.</p>	<p>The importance of views towards Cam Peak are highlighted and identified as locally valued views to be protected. The setting of the AONB is also acknowledged to be important and policy Es2 aims to protect that setting from inappropriate development.</p>

186	Page 43	As a dog walker I use the snickets on a regular basis from Upper Cam to Tilsdown and to Sandpits through Holywell Orchard. They are a safer route for pedestrians and dog walkers alike to stray from the busier and busier roads.	Preserve them and keep them coming in future developments and keep them as green as possible as wildlife corridors with mixed planting ie avoiding rows of conifers as proposed by developers at Box Road development. I would go so far as to say no mixed hedging or trees to be stripped away for houses,they should be built around them.	Noted
187	Page 49	The proposed Green Spaces are fairly well spread out on this map. I would argue that Street Farm Field and Littlecombe Meadow need to be one area as a whole but as they are visually different and have different usage, and are owned by different landowners maybe this is why they are depicted as 2 currently. The eye is drawn to this, whereas the others are spaced out. (I note they are wrongly labelled but as an NDP member I have mentioned this to be amended). I am very much an upholder of green spaces as we are now in an ever faster and busy world. When our mental health and wellbeing are being challenged by this and currently this is the subject of much talk, these are areas that should be regularly spaced in a community for everyone to enjoy and sometimes congregate ie Cam Sports Ground.	Maintenance of current green spaces and there is opportunity to create even improved spaces in new development, once again to provide wildlife corridors in a country village setting.	Local Green Space map (Figure 15) labelling has been amended. There was an error in the Regulation 14 version of the NDP which showed Street Farm Field and Littlecombe Meadow labelled the wrong way round. The next version of the NDP shows LGS8 - Street Farm Field and LGS9 - Littlecombe Meadow. This is consistent with the numbering of the Regulation 14 Local Green Space Report.
188	General	Rackleaze wildlife reserve. This could be even better and is relatively poor compared with other village ponds etc. This is no reflection on the volunteers that have vastly improved it but the quality of the River Cam in this area was poor last time I saw it with multiple plastic bottles and litter collecting in a certain area within the river itself.	This may well have been cleared up and was hoping to get there to assess before my comment but time constraints and memory haven't allowed this. Definitely needed waders and several able bodied people.	Noted
189	General, O9	Transport Comments: The NDP and its comprehensive coverage of local planning matters is welcomed. It shows close understanding of local movement and connectivity issues and aligns with the Local Transport Plan and the transport policies outlined in the Stroud Connecting Places Strategy. The NDP objective O9 could be extended to recognise the need to identify and reinforce links to areas of new strategic development sites. Local transport solutions including path upgrades can often be best identified and generated at a grassroots level. Cam is well positioned to benefit from its rail links and those links will need to be increasingly multidirectional, whereas historically they would have been stronger to its south. The recognition of the role and importance of the rail station in improving connectivity to the wider area is welcomed as is the requirement to improve facilities and bus connections.	Opportunities should be taken to request that strategic developments create opportunities for transport mode shift and finer grain of movement as an outcome of that development and in conjunction with the Stroud Local Plan. Note in particular the need to support and safeguard quieter routes particularly linking transport hubs and key destinations	The Cam Code sets out the need to identify and reinforce links to areas of new strategic development sites, and highlights an existing fine grained system of movement in Cam that should be continued in new developments.
190	General	Ecology (Biodiversity) Comments Ecology (Biodiversity) Comments SRA/HRA Screening advice for the Plan Looking at biodiversity (ecology/wildlife) alone the need for a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and/or Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the draft consultation version of the NDP appears unlikely. The District Council and Natural England should be able to give a definitive view on these matters if not already.		Statutory consultees have been consulted on this matter.
191	General, p19	The Plan Content: We can see that the Gloucestershire Centre for Environmental Records (GCER) has been contacted and the main biodiversity constraints have been identified and taken into account in formulating the NDP. The vision, objectives and resulting policies give some added support for the conservation and enhancement of local biodiversity. Proposed Policy CAMES1 (Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity) and CAMCD" (Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows) are appropriate. Overall there are no compelling ecological reasons to recommend any change to the wording of the NDP policies.	You may wish to note that Key Wildlife Sites are now known as Local Wildlife Sites (Gloucestershire Local Nature Partnership, 2019) and so you may wish to make an edit in the plan towards the end of page 19.	Noted

192	General	Public Health Comments: There is a good range of policies that will have a positive impact on the health and wellbeing of the community, including Green Infrastructure, active travel and employment, that seems appropriate in the context of an NDP.		Noted
193	Page 40	Full support of Development Plan. Details of dates for the implementation of Greenway Construction Missing	Focus Group required to campaign for urgency in this matter.	The detail of the Greenway construction is outside the scope of this Plan.
194	Page 10	How will the county provide enough school places for the children in the new houses?		Outside the scope of this Plan.
195	Page 24	The fields around "Old Cam" show historic strip cultivation as shown on the 1750's map held by the Berkeley Estate.		Noted
196	Page 39	More parking is needed at Cam and Dursley Station and there should be a better bus link.		Noted though parking and bus services are outside the scope of this plan.
197	Page 41 Policy CAMMC1	It's not clear where the public footpath from Upper Cam to Long Street, Dursley runs. There used to be a footpath through the fields with one small hill at the end-it would be good to have a flat footpath.		Noted
198	Page 53	It would be good to have a small enclosed pre school playground near the café so that young mums can enjoy a coffee while their children play safely.		Noted
199	12241	The ground is well kept and with the chestnut trees provides a tranquil setting.		Noted
200	12242	It has been the home of Cam Cricket Club since 1923.		Noted.
201	12243	Cam Sports Club is the home of Cam Cricket which runs 3 senior teams and has a very strong junior development section. Cam Football Club has 3 senior teams. Cam Tennis Club which runs 3 mens and 3 ladies teams in summer and 4 mixed doubles in winter leagues and is looking to start a strong junior section again.		Noted
202	4 General Planning Policies, P39. Movement and Connectivity	The current speed limit on Taitshill, 50, is hazardous. Many drivers take the bend at the top coming up from the A38 too fast. I know of one serious accident (fatality)? In the past.		This point is outside the scope of this plan
203	Community Facilities, P45 O12	Re:GP facilities. With the expansion of population in the Box Road area there will be increasing pressure on the Cam Surgery. Car parking and increasing traffic will be a major problem.	Is there a case for another surgery nearer the population?	This point is outside the scope of this plan
204	Cam Design Code, P11 para 2.2	The snicket network is a very valuable asset. Snicket 47 from Holywell Orchard and Ryder Close is potentially dangerous. The steps are poorly designed and when wet or covered with leaves are hazardous. It is my understanding that the course of this snicket was altered at the time of development. The ownership of the steps is unclear.		The variety in the quality of the snickets is noted.
205	Page 45 O12	Cam Sports Club currently rent the land for playing sport. Should the lease run out then this could give rise to there being "no prospect of continued community use"	Tighten the wording to state "As long as there is a demonstrable continued community requirement for use.	Wording of policy has been reviewed and amended.
206	Page 48, O12	The clubhouse facilities at Cam Sports Club are in need of major refurbishment/in need of rebuild. We have concerns that being listed under Local Green Space designation may prevent these future required plans from occurring.	Ensure that sports facilities can be rebuilt if required.	The boundary of the proposed Local Green Space has been drawn to run alongside the access lane, and exclude the built development and other facilities on the site. This is because LGS designation over these facilities may prevent their future improvement by way of preventing development except for in exceptional circumstances - the way that the boundary is drawn in the proposals avoids this.

207	Page 21 O1	Wildlife can only thrive if appropriate environments are provided and importantly linked.	Ensure wildlife rich environments are protected and linked via wildlife corridors (like the disused railway). Ensure all new build projects incorporate wildlife positive planning designs. - Green Spaces, bat boxes, hedgehog friendly fencing.	Noted - the Cam NDP aims to underpin a comprehensive approach to bio-diversity and Green Infrastructure
208	48	I am very pleased that Cam Sports Ground is recognised as a designated Green Space. The only concern I have is that the facilities there badly need a financial influx to allow them to continue. Income from membership is not sufficient to cover re-build costs. It would be helpful if funds could be found to assist with both maintenance and rebuild of the clubhouse facilities. My family have used the facilities provided by tennis, cricket and football at this venue for more than 25 years. I am relieved that this will not be considered for new build.		Noted
209	General	We are all in favour of local development as long as the infrastructure such as schools, employment, are also dealt with. We need more measures in place to protect employment. Lots of jobs gone already. The idea of cycleways is excellent, make it safer for children to ride to school. Also make sure any areas of woodland destroyed by development are reinstated within the site.		Noted
210	General	General Comments as follows: 1. Stop proposal to build on Green Spaces in Cam especially between Manor Avenue to Draycott. The area opposite Peveldans is Green Space where children play and would spoil views across to Cam Peak.		No development sites are proposed in this plan
211		2. More housing needed for over 60's instead of demolishing perfectly good developments like Cambridge House in Dursley. Glebelands could be improved for the elderly.		Noted
212		3. More Eco houses like Ty Solar Associates in Wales. Refer to Western.Solar.org.uk for more information based in Wales.		Noted - Policy on Sustainable design and construction amended
213		4. New housing with solar panels.		Noted - Policy on Sustainable design and construction amended, but this particular feature cannot be required
214		5. A monthly Farmers Market outside Berry Blue, this was an event when cafe first opened, local produce cheeses, pickles etc.		Noted but this comment is outside the scope of the Plan.
215		6. Building of/improving existing schools and doctors/dentist surgeries.		Noted
216	8	Agree with Cam Design Plan so any changes to the area blend in with the surroundings	Restore rather than replace.	Noted
217	34 Cam cd2	Protect trees and hedgerows	Plant more to help nature and enhance the area.	Noted
218	48 LGS 7,8,9,10	Protect Green Spaces, sport for all good places for dog walkers quiet area close to homes LGS-Home for a diverse group of animals plus a number of butterfly species.		Noted
219	58	Upper Cam should be a conservation area.		Noted. It is acknowledged to be an important area of heritage for Cam, but designation of a Conservation Area is outside the scope of this plan
220	General	No concerns to note.		Noted
221		Offered a stall at the Chantry Centre during Dursley Festival.		Noted
222		Need for improvements at Jubilee Field.		Noted
223		Speed of traffic along A4135		Speed restrictions are outside the scope of this plan
224		Traffic along railway and development at Hopton		Speed restrictions are outside the scope of this plan

225		<p>As Chairman of Cam Cricket Club I feel the need to contribute to the discussion on the local in fact only green area/ space left in the heart of Cam.</p> <p>As a Cricket Club we are all extremely proud on a summer Saturday, many people from the village support our teams, and use the club. The position is idyllic and we are all proud of where we play, and, most importantly none of us want to lose it for housing, especially when many new estates are being built around our station area.</p> <p>The facility is used year round by all ages, from youth under 9s playing all stars cricket on a Friday, to senior citizens playing tennis year round. Not to mention Cam Bulldogs FC whose players take pride in representing Cam especially with Dursley town being refurbished their loyalty has been outstanding.</p> <p>To lose this special green area would be nothing short of criminal, the residents of Everlands want it to stay as a green area, as do all the members of Cam Sports Club, I am sure you all agree it is situated in a lovely part of our village and long may it remain so .</p>		Noted.
226	Page 21 Para 5	We support this policy that any development that has any harmful impact on biodiversity and wildlife and species should be refused.	Would like assurances in the policy that mitigation or compensation is not seen as a way of forcing through building work.	Green Infrastructure assets are one element of what will be considered in a planning application. This policy seeks to strengthen the importance of Cam's bio-diversity.
227	Page 48	We absolutely support this policy for all of the Local Green Spaces to protect wildlife and habitats, as well as the recreational sites and sport facilities. Sites such as Littlecombe Meadow , Street Farm Field and Riverside, Everlands are vitally important as Local Green Spaces in order to protect species but also for the enjoyment of the community-these spaces also serve to promote good mental health and a sense of well being. There has been a notable increase of people out and about using these lovely areas lately. The playing fields and sports ground have huge physical and social benefits. Finally, we would just like to say that we support the whole plan with it's green focus, the promotion of cycling and walking routes and the overall wellbeing of the community. At a time when environmental issues have become so critical.		Noted.
228		<p>On 16th July 2019, the Council's Planning Committee reviewed the draft plan published for the Regulation 14 Consultation. The Council would like to endorse and support the document.</p> <p>The draft plan is very well thought out and impressive in its coverage and structure. It is clear that a lot of thought and effort has gone into it.</p> <p>The links to Dursley are clear, with mention that Dursley and Cam together make up a tier one settlement within the district. There is also support for the Greenway project which strengthens the transport links between the two settlements.</p> <p>We look forward to the plan progressing through the remaining stages of the process and to it being adopted as a statutory planning document.</p>		Noted with thanks
229		<p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>See separate annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan</p>		Noted

230		<p>Thank you for providing Highways England with an opportunity to comment on your pre-submission draft Neighbourhood Plan. As you are aware, we are responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the Strategic Road Network (SRN) including the M5 and A417 and it is in the context of these responsibilities that our comments are made. The draft Neighbourhood Plan identifies that Cam is a focus for strategic growth in Stroud as set out in the Stroud District Local Plan 2013-2031 (adopted November 2015). Local Plan policy CP2 allocates 12ha of employment land and 450 dwellings at the North East Cam Urban Extension (Site Allocation SA3), which is the proposed growth identified within the draft Cam Neighbourhood Plan. Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IOP) Position Statements were developed as part of the Local Plan to identify the expected infrastructure requirements, likely costs and timing of delivery at the Strategic Allocation Sites. The 'Stroud District Council Infrastructure Delivery Plan North East Cam Strategic Allocation (SA3) Infrastructure Position Statement April 2016' identifies the infrastructure required to support the delivery of Allocation SA3, and therefore the neighbourhood Plan growth. In respect of the SRN, it is identified that highways improvements will be required at the following junctions to accommodate this Neighbourhood Plan/Allocation SA3 growth;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Junction B: A419 A46 Dudbridge Road Roundabout • Junction D: A419 London Road Dr Newton's Way • Junction M: M5 Junction 14 84509. <p>Highways England would therefore expect all development coming forward within the Neighbourhood Plan to fully assess the traffic impact on these SRN junctions, and that any development needs to come forward in step with the infrastructure required to support it, as set out in the overarching Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Plan(s).</p>		Noted
231		<p>We are aware that the Stroud Local Plan is currently under review and Highways England is looking forward to continued engagement with the Local Planning Authority to develop an appropriate and robust evidence base to enable us to respond positively to the plan, which will include the growth at Cam. These comments do not prejudice any future responses Highways England may make on site specific applications as they come forward through the planning process, and which will be considered by us on their merits under the prevailing policy at the time. If it would be helpful to discuss any of the above, please don't hesitate to contact me.</p>		See above
232	Cam Development Strategy, Page 14/60	<p>While supporting the overall Neighbourhood Development Plan, we wish to comment on the intention to link Box Road via a cycleway to Court House Gardens. Would it not be dangerous to bring cyclists out on the main road at this point</p>	<p>We feel the Greenway should encompass the existing footpath, which runs parallel to the River Cam from Uphorpe Road (behind The Railway tavern) across to Middle Mill and onwards to Draycott.</p>	Noted. The precise route of the Greenway is still being established and is outside the scope of this plan.
233	page 17/60	<p>We notice with satisfaction that the fields alongside Hopton Road which provide rural separation between the two Cam parishes, are clearly designated as "Local Green Space". We strongly support the retention of this designation in the context of much local concern about the future of these fields.</p>		Noted, this comment is incorporated in the LGS report
234		<p>Our final point is to raise concern about the dangerous nature of the junction between the main road and Box Road. With work on the new building site now underway this problem will rapidly be exacerbated. The Highway Authority must address this matter urgently.</p>		Noted
235		<p>The ecological aspects are good and must be enforced. Any development should be subject to the provision of green space and planting of trees. All new buildings should have provision for wildlife for example bat boxes/slits and bird boxes (swifts and sparrows)</p>		Noted

236		I could find no mention of education /schools , although the documents were long winded and unwieldy. The schools in Cam/Dursley are stretched to bursting and it's difficult to see how extra pupils are going to be accommodated. A new primary unit is needed to serve Box Road maybe with Slimbridge. Hopton and Everlands should be combined and given more space. It is a shame that Box Road pupils , especially juniors, will not be able to walk to school.		education / school provision is outside the scope of the Plan
237		Parking is an issue on all new developments and the Bymacks site in Dursley is a good example of what happens when insufficient space is provided (cars and vans parked along both sides of the main through road making it impassable for larger/emergency vehicles). Garages when provided are never used for cars the houses are so small that the garage is needed for storage. Spaces must be allocated on the developments so that overspill doesn't encroach on neighbouring areas (minimum 2 spaces per dwelling).		Noted - Parking standards are set by Gloucestershire County Council
238		Would vote for the plan in the future though I worry about the influx of people on all the existing services. I commented on the online questionnaire about protecting the local green spaced in Upper Cam and want Street Farm Field which adjoins my property saved. It is a haven for wildlife and we walk our dog daily across the footpath together with many others. It's used regularly by runners and walking groups and it's the last piece of green between us and the Littlecombe Estate.		Noted
239		I agree with everything my wife has said above especially about saving Street Farm Field for the future inhabitants of the village.		Noted
240	Objectives	Support objectives 01, 02,03,04, 05, 06,07 and 08.		Noted
241	Objective 09	What does strengthen mean?	Clarification required Suggest also including reference to providing access to the countryside for people who are less able. (ie including those with mobility issues)	Access improvements are covered in the Green Infrastructure Report which is supporting evidence to the Plan
242	Figure 6.	Very difficult to identify sites, especially if enlarge map on-line.	Base map quality needs to be improved.	Will aim to improve resolution
243	Policy CAMESii.		Policy CAMESii. Suggest adding reference to providing access for people who are less able. (ie including those with mobility issues) Policy CAMESii. Suggest adding "...and, where possible, connecting to existing green infrastructure and the wider countryside." Explanation under Policy CAMESiii. Suggest adding to the end of 1st para GI is also important for the health and well being of the community. Where there is existing or proposed public access to GI it should include wherever possible access for people who are less able.	Noted.
244	Figure 7	Green Infrastructure Assets Map: Local Footpath Links Unclear why these particular local footpath loops have been included and not other key PROW, for example key routes which access Stinchcombe Hill and connect to the Cotswold Way. Details in the supporting text of the Green Infrastructure Report and appendix 3 of this report refer to the loop footpaths but the Lantern Way has been shown incorrectly on Fig 7. By showing only some of the PROW, this may imply that other PROW not shown are not so important.		Noted - figure 7 has been amended

245	Fig 7	New Kissing Gate Proposals: Although some new kissing gates are shown on Fig 7 the Parish Council has supported the provision of other kissing gates on other routes at the meeting of the Leisure Committee Meeting on 15 February 2017, when they considered a report on Cam's Accessible Paths Project.	Suggest showing these additional kissing gate proposals on Fig 7.	Figure 7 has been amended and kissing gate proposals are detailed in the Green Infrastructure Report
246	Fig 7	Support green gaps shown on Fig 7.		Noted
247	Fig 7/8	Fig 8 Landscape setting Base map not clear, particularly when enlarged on line. Only one Green Gap shown, whereas on Fig 7 there are two. Supporting explanation also only refers to one gap.		Noted - Figure 8 amended
248	Policy CAMES3	Policy CAMES3 Landscape and Locally Valued Views Support identification of locally valued views.		
249	Fig 9	Fig 9 Key Landscape Features and Valued Views Base map not clear, particularly when enlarged on line. Concerned that the direction of some of the views identified are insufficient. For example view point 1 has 360 degree view and view point 3 has 270 degree view. Also not sure that view point 2 is in the correct location. Perhaps it should be slightly further to the west on Stinchcombe Hill and the view direction looking north, north west? Key to Fig 9 not clear as the same numbering is used for view points and landmarks and the landmarks are not numbered on the map.		Figure 9 amended.
250	Policy CAMCD1	Policy CAMCD1 support : Explanation -the eight character areas do not take into account the new development currently taking place off Box Road.	Suggest this area is included on Fig 10.	This map reflects the areas currently developed.
251	Policy CAMCD1		Suggest the 20th century character area type is amended to "20th and 21st century character area type".	Noted. Text to be amended
252	Policy CAMCD2		Policy CAMCD2: Suggest adding to Policy - Trees/woodland/hedgerows to be retained in development schemes should be adequately protected from harm during the construction period.	This is an important point that is covered in the Cam Design Code
253	Fig 11	Fig 11 Key Trees in Cam Very poor quality. Very difficult to identify accurately the location of key individual trees in particular.		Will aim to improve resolution
254	Policy CAMCD3		Suggest adding to Policy CAMCD3 reference to the need for the provision of adequate on site facilities for the recycling and storing of waste and the provision of electric charging points for cars including in all residential developments. Explanation refers to "high quality, efficient and sustainably designed housing developments". Surely this policy should refer to all types of development not just housing?	Policy has been amended. Electric charging point specifically not included as technology is rapidly changing.

255	Policy CAMMC1	Policy CAMMC1 connections for cyclists and pedestrians	<p>Suggest policy includes reference to providing accessibility for people with mobility issues wherever possible. Suggest policy includes reference to PROW as well as snickers.</p> <p>Explanation to Policy CAMMC1 Suggest 2nd para should be amended to include reference to the provision of kissing gates to facilitate access to and within the wider countryside for people with mobility issues.</p>	Policy amended to include reference to inclusive design
256	Fig 13 Snickets	Fig 13 Snickets Poor quality- very difficult to identify location of snickets. Key not shown in NP only in supporting report		Key now shown in NP.
257	Policy CAMCF2	Policy CAMCF2 support. Projects		Noted
258	Projects	<p>3. Getting around our Parish</p> <p>Amend title to "Getting around our Parish and Access to the Wider Countryside"</p> <p>5th bullet point add Highway Authority.</p> <p>Suggest adding a further bullet point- Implement Report approved by Parish Council Leisure Committee on 15 February 2017- Cam's Accessible Paths Project. Improving access to the countryside for all in the interests of local residents health and wellbeing.</p>		Noted and projects section updated
259	Foreword	Pegasus note that the Chair of the Parish Council, on behalf of the NDP Steering Group, is positive with regard to the delivery of additional dwellings in the Parish through the Stroud Local Plan Review. This accords with paragraphs 13 and 29 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Feb 2019) (NPPF) (Planning practice guidance Paragraph: 070 Reference ID: 41-070-20190509) for development plans to plan positively for growth; to not promote less development than set out in strategic policies for the area nor to undermine strategic policies (Planning practice guidance Paragraph: 076 Reference ID: 41-076-20190509).	State that the NPPF requires Neighbourhood Plans to support the delivery of strategic policies contained in Local Plans.	Noted
260	General comment	Pegasus note the considerable time that has been given by the local community and the work that has been undertaken by those preparing the Neighbourhood Plan to get it to Regulation 14 Consultation stage with all its associated documentation.		Noted with thanks
261	General comment	<p>Once adopted the CNP will comprise part of the Development Plan. To that end the document needs to be user friendly for decision makers and those using the CNP to prepare development proposals.</p> <p>The CNP makes no allocations, however as currently presented it is accompanied by 3 substantial Appendices and a significant evidence base all of which requires interrogation to understand fully the policies in the plan.</p>	Consider simplifying the evidence base and number of documents that comprise the NDP to ensure it is a document that can be easily used and understood by decision takers.	The evidence base documents all support the delivery of the policies in the Plan.

262	P6	<p>Reference to the NPPF should be to the latest revised version of the NPPF (Feb 2019).</p> <p>Stroud District Council are currently in the process of preparing the Stroud Local Plan Review and due regard should be had to the emerging strategic policies of this plan in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Should there be any conflict between the policies of the Stroud Local Plan Review, once adopted, and the CNP the most recently adopted development plan policy will take precedence;</p> <p><i>"Should there be a conflict between a policy in a neighbourhood plan and a policy in a local plan or spatial development strategy, section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to become part of the development plan."</i> (Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph: 044 Reference ID: 41-044020190509)</p>	<p>Update reference to NPPF to Feb 2019 and amend any paragraph references accordingly. To state in the text that the Stroud Local Plan Review (SLPR) is in the process of being prepared and that it considers Cam to be a strategic development location.</p> <p>Also state that once adopted the SLPR will provide the strategic planning policy for the Parish, with the CNP providing locally distinctive policies to supplement the SLPR.</p>	Agreed. Amendments made accordingly
263	P8 and Appendix 3 Cam Design Code	<p><u>Cam Design Code</u></p> <p>The Landscape and Green Infrastructure approach to design is noted, however the requirements of the Design Code need to be held in balance with the requirements of national planning policy in the NPPF to significantly boost the supply of housing and to make the best use of land where it is allocated for development purposes through strategic planning policy.</p> <p>The requirements of the Codes relating to gateways, junctions, roadside verges etc will also be subject to and have to comply with Gloucestershire County Council Design Requirements;</p> <p>Is it worth including a discussion regarding SuDs, which with a properly designed system would include attenuation ponds the locations of which are set by topography and then use these areas as opportunities to be within the landscape edge of a development?</p> <p>Under Code 1 (Snicket Design) the illustration shows lighting however this will not always be desirable given the need to consider wildlife and the potential for bat paths;</p> <p>Cam Code 4b (Creating Visual Connections to Cam's Landscape Setting): should not be expressed as a "must" as there may be other constraints impacting on the best design solution; for example SuDs and site access;</p> <p>No mention is made in the document of density of development.</p>		Comments noted and amendments made places in response to comments. Key point to note here is that this document is intended to be used to inform and shape locally responsive developer masterplans to come forward on any allocated site.

264		<p>The requirements of the design code as currently written may require a larger land take to accommodate the strategic growth required through the Stroud Local Plan review than may be required by allowing developer masterplans to come forward.</p> <p>Our client's site is located to the North West of Cam and within the area identified in the emerging Stroud District Local Plan review as PS24 (West of Draycott) as a potential site for development.</p> <p>The site offers the opportunity for new development to integrate with and support the existing community of Cam by providing new green infrastructure connectivity and enhancements to community facilities.</p> <p>Pegasus also note the proximity of our client's site to Cam railway station and alongside a proposed cycle route, and the opportunities this presents for sustainable travel.</p>		See above
265	Chapter 3 p.16	<p>Pegasus note the comment at the end of 4th para 'land to the north is less constrained in landscape terms for future development and the M5 forms a strong edge to the west, where it is visible at points not screened with significant trees, belts and bunds.'</p>		Noted
266	Figure 6 Draft CNP Wildlife Sites and habitats plan	<p>The landscape and green infrastructure approach to future development is noted</p> <p>Figure 6 is noted as are the existing Green Links - intact hedgerows/tree lines - shown at our client's site. Should this area be allocated in the future for strategic housing growth purposes it may be necessary for alterations to be made to existing hedgerows subject to net biodiversity gain and mitigation proposals.</p> <p>The existing wooded area between the mainline railway and the motorway is also noted.</p>		Noted and understood that alterations to existing Green Infrastructure features may need to happen. The Plan acknowledges that retention may not be possible and supports new biodiversity gain.
267	Policy CAMES1	<p>This policy has to be understandable and useable by decision makers, as currently written it is not clear to a decision maker what type of development it relates to, is it for all development or just developments of a certain size?</p> <p>While existing green infrastructure will inform the design process of a development scheme green infrastructure strategies and management plans are often conditional requirements of planning permissions.</p> <p>It could prove counterproductive for this policy to require submission of a GI management plan for a site prior to grant of planning permission owing to amendments that are often made between submission and the grant of planning permission.</p> <p>Reference to the NPPF should be amended to Feb 2019 NPPF.</p> <p>Paragraph 175 of the NPPF does not require the retention of all existing green infrastructure but places emphasis on mitigation and compensation for biodiversity and habitats that are not designated as nationally important, as well as securing measurable net gains for biodiversity.</p>	<p>That the need for submission of a Green Infrastructure Strategy and Management Plan on submission of a planning application be removed from the policy.</p> <p>That the policy refer to 'net biodiversity gain' rather than the need to 'enhance and maintain green links to support biodiversity' – in accordance with criteria d) of NPPF para 175 and PPG para 006 Ref ID: 8-006- 20190721</p>	Noted. Policy amended.

268	<p>p.23 Fig 7 LGIC2: M5 Corridor</p>	<p>Concern is raised over whether the extent of the proposed LGIC2 as shown at Fig 7 is NPPF compliant. The evidence base for LGIC2 comprises 3 reports stated on p. 22 as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cam Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (2018) • Cam Green Infrastructure Report (2018) – NB Evidence base for consultation states v.7 May 2019 • Cam Code (2019) <p>None of the above documents provide evidence that requires the extent of LGIC2 to be as shown on Fig 7. Currently Fig 7 could be interpreted by a decision maker as compromising the developability of our client's site.</p> <p>The Potterton Landscape Sensitivity report (2018) includes our client's site within character area 08 and broad landscape area A. Paragraph 4.14 & 4.15 state; '4.1.4 Our overall conclusion is that sites 7a and 8 are entirely logical and together provide a sensible and 'least harmful' area where the future expansion of Cam should take place.</p> <p>4.1.5 Further work is needed to ensure that any sites that do come forward are underpinned by an appropriate level of assessment and masterplanning. A fully detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment would be the absolute minimum in each case and very specifically in respect of 8 due to the need to retain recreation facilities and the extensive PROW network.'</p> <p>The Potterton Report site specific findings of Site 8, conforming its appropriateness for the future expansion of Cam are attached at Appendix 1.</p> <p>Cam Green Infrastructure Report states that 'LGICs are linear elements of GI, linking local sites and delivering connectivity of assets between and within different parts of the parish.'</p>	<p>The annotation for LGIC2:M5 green edge should be amended at Fig 7 to make clear that the width is indicative only.</p> <p>The text of the CNP does not adequately draw out the findings of the evidence in the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment as it does not clearly indicate which parts of the Neighbourhood Area are least sensitive to new development and therefore most appropriate for the future expansion of CAM.</p>	<p>Noted. Figure 7 is diagrammatic only.</p>
269		<p>For LGIC2 the evidence document states; "The M5 forms an edge to the west, where it is visible when not screened with trees belts and bunds. GI opportunities here include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinforcing the existing extensive hedgerows and significant embankment planting – a key linear habitat asset • Addressing any gaps, such as one to the south west end by Woodend Lane flyover" <p>It is considered that the northern extent of LGIC2 does not deliver connectivity to the north of the railway line as the railway currently severs the corridor and the PROW leads to the A4135 to the south of the railway bridge.</p> <p>No mention is made of the Local Green Infrastructure Policies shown in Fig 7 in Policy CAMES1 – the relationship between the draft Policy and the status of Green Infrastructure Corridors in Fig 7 is therefore unclear.</p>		<p>See above</p>
270	<p>As above</p>	<p>Net biodiversity enhancement along the route of the PROW and across our client's wider site should determine the depth of the GI linkages in this location, a blanket width of the corridor should not be applied as proposed in Fig 7.</p> <p>The Cam Design Code (Appendix 3 of the NDP) contains no reference to the need for LGIC2 to be of a particular depth.</p>		<p>Agreed. Figure 7 is diagrammatic only. The supporting evidence base report will be revised to clarify this.</p>

271	P22 Building with Nature	<p>Building with Nature is a tool that has been developed through collaboration between Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust and the University of the West of England– it is not currently a statutory, or locally adopted requirement of the Stroud Local Plan for this tool to be used for the consideration of planning applications.</p>	<p>While the benefits of a Building with Nature accreditation for a development scheme is acknowledged, its use is not a statutory requirement in either national or locally adopted planning policy. The CNP cannot therefore require through its policies the use of the Building with Nature tool, or other tools that adopt such principles as this would be unlikely to meet the Basic Conditions test.</p> <p>The local planning authority will consult with relevant statutory and local environmental agencies during the consideration of planning applications and any relevant consultee comments and recommendations will be taken into account in the determination of applications.</p>	<p>The Plan does not require a Building with Nature Accreditation, but instead encourages it as great importance is placed on G.I as a way of enabling the delivery sustainable development in the future with particular emphasis on Parish wellbeing, water and wildlife. Reference to Building with Nature to be retained.</p>
272	p27 Photograph of May Hill	<p>This photograph across the Severn Vale, over the River Severn and towards May Hill has been taken using a telephoto lens and does not accurately represent the view of the naked eye at the point it which it was taken.</p> <p>Inclusion of the photo in the CNP is misleading as it gives a false impression of the setting of the village given that the M5 and the north south mainline railway are situated between the village and the River Severn. NB This photo is also used in the Cam Views Report (2019) at p.10.</p> <p>Indeed, the two photographs at the bottom of p.27 do not have titles and the text of the document does not refer to them.</p>		<p>Photograph of this key view retaken using standard lens</p>
273	p26 Policy CAME3	<p>Policy CAME3 requires views from public vantage points to be retained as indicated at Figure 9.</p> <p>Figure 9 indicates protected view 8 which is observed from Halmore Lane out across the Severn Vale in a north westerly direction.</p> <p>The Cam Valued Views Report (2019) states that View 8 is towards Box Road, north Cam and the Forest of Dean. A photo of a winter scene of the view is included in the evidence base document.</p> <p>It should be noted that a summer view of this scene would be quite different with the mature trees in the fore and centre ground and the existing hedges providing substantial screening of the countryside and built form beyond.</p> <p>This evidence document contains photographs that are not consistent with regard to the time of year they were taken, or the amount of telephoto used in the image.</p> <p>Moreover, this evidence base document conflicts with the Landscape Evidence document that states that Area 8 is the most suitable area for the future growth of Cam – Locally Valued View 8 would seek to maintain the existing pastoral view towards and across Area 8 from the Cam Parish boundary, which is shown on the Gloucestershire PROW map to be a bridleway.</p>	<p>The Cam Valued Views Report (2019) should be consistent in its use of photographic imagery in terms of the season of the year used for each photo.</p> <p>Each photo or view to be protected should be shown at the same point in the year.</p>	<p>Seasonality of the landscape and views is central to people's enjoyment. The majority of the views identified are illustrated at the same time of year. The images will be reviewed to check consistency</p>

274	p31 Policy CAMCD1	It is suggested that matters relating to the Cam Community Design Statement (2018) and Cam Design Code (2019) are simplified in order for them to be more easily integrated into the Neighbourhood Plan and its associated policies.	Simplify the number of design documents that provide evidence for and support the CNP and its associate policies.	The Cam Design Code is the key document and is therefore included as appendix to the plan. The Design Statement is the result of much work on the part of the local residents of the Steering Group is a reference document in the evidence base which can be used to inform a design response based on analysis of local character and positive features.
275	p34 Policy CAMCD2	New strategic growth at CAM may require the loss of hedgerow sections in order to achieve safe access or for other technical matters. It is unreasonable of draft Policy CAMCD2 to state that the loss of any trees or hedgerows will not be permitted. Indeed, trees or hedgerows not covered by a statutory designation and not associated with a development could be removed at any point in time without the need for any statutory consent. Concern is raised over the evidence and justification to require the replanting of lost trees at a rate of 2 new trees for every one tree lost.	Amend the second paragraph of CAMCD2 such that it is positively prepared in accordance with the NPPF.	Agreed. Policy reviewed
276	p37 Policy CAMCD3	The way Policy CAMCD3 is written infers that support will not be forthcoming for proposals that do not use eco- building methods. On this basis the Policy as written is considered unreasonable and contrary to the NPPF which requires development plan documents to 'significantly boost' the supply of housing. Development which meets the requirements of current building regulation standards should be supported by those preparing the Neighbourhood Plan in order to accord with national planning policy.	If Policy CAMCD3 adds nothing to adopted Local Planning Policy in the Stroud Local Plan it should be removed from the CNP.	Policy amended
277	p38 CAMCD4		The Neighbourhood Plan should be sense checked against the latest Planning Practice Guidance revisions dated July 2019 which amongst other changes include the following new categories; effective use of land, appropriate assessment and housing supply and delivery.	The Cam Parish Pre-Application Protocol , in line with the NPPF, enables early, proactive and effective engagement with the community which will enable applicatons to be looked on more favourably than applications that have not.
278	p41 CAMMC1	The last paragraph needs to be amended to be consistent with amendments that are required to the Cam Design Code to ensure consistency with Gloucestershire County Council Design Requirements	The last paragraph of Policy CAMMC1 should be amended to reflect the comments we have made on the Cam Design Code i.e. the requirements of the Codes relating to gateways, junctions, roadside verges etc will be subject to and need to comply with Gloucestershire County Council Design Requirements.	The Cam Design Code has been amended to include reference to the County Council design requirements.

<p>Local Green Space Report and Policy CAMCF2</p> <p>279</p>	<p>See full copy of this letter in Local Green Space Report</p> <p>Site location and Description</p> <p>The Street Farm field (referred to as the SF field below) is located at the extreme south east corner of Cam and abuts the Parish boundary. It is situated outside of the settlement development limit.</p> <p>Its setting is shown in the aerial photograph attached. To the east it is contiguous with open land which stretches to the AONB and in part abuts four houses in a cul de sac, Springfield Old Court, which is a finger protruding into the wider countryside.</p> <p>To the west it abuts a field referred to as Littlecombe Meadow in the draft Cam NDP. Littlecombe Meadow is also outside of the settlement development limit.</p> <p>To the north is remainder of the Street Farm field for which LGS status is not proposed. The boundary between the parishes of Cam and Dursley is on its southern boundary. The Street Farm field has been divided into 3 sections by 2 fences for some 30 years and the proposal in the draft Cam NDP is that two of these smaller areas are designed as a Local Green Space (LGS)</p> <p>The Street Farm field is private land to which there is no legal access. The field has been used for cattle, sheep and mown for hay by the present owners of Street Farm over the last 35 years. In recent years the land has been untended. Throughout this time the land has not been used by the public. Indeed fencing across the two of the 3 field sections would make these respective areas difficult to access</p> <p>The most southerly section of the land is crossed by 3 public footpaths. These link Springfields Old Court and the open fields to the east of the SF field to the field referred to as Littlecombe Meadow. Littlecombe Meadow is a designated open space in the Masterplan for the Littlecombe Estate.</p>		<p>Noted. Description of the space in Local Green Space Report has been amended to reflect these comments</p>
--	--	--	---

280	<p>The basis of the proposal for LGS designation</p> <p>We were advised on 18 October 2018 that the NDP Steering Committee had nominated the SF field as a LGS and intended to seek community views. After unsuccessfully pressing Mr Gowcutt, Chairman of the Steering Committee, for details of the assessment that resulted in nomination and the process involved, eventually on 30 November the Chairman of Cam Parish Council responded. He confirmed that the SF field had not been identified in a long list of 41 possible green spaces and did not appear in the short list of sites to be further considered. No rationale or criteria for the selection of the site by the Steering Committee were given and no explanation for how the field came to be nominated after a extended process involving both long listing and short listing were given. He confirmed that the NDP Steering Group had nominated the SF field in relation to its:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Recreational Use: The Public Rights of Way across the land are of local importance, especially due to their links to walks in the nearby countryside • Beauty: The space is considered a pleasant green gap between the urban area of Cam and the countryside." <p>The National Planning Policy Framework and relevant Planning Practice Guidance notes that LGS designation should only be given where the green space holds a particular significance and is special to the community, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites of significant recreational value (including as a playing field) • Sites of locally significant beauty <p>Against these statements, nomination against recreational value merely on the basis that an otherwise private field has rights of way must be judged a remarkable decision by the Steering Committee</p> <p>Nomination by claiming it as pleasant gap between the urban area of Cam and the countryside when it is bounded by open space on three sides and the Parish boundary between Cam and Dursley on the fourth is false. The urban area of Cam is to the north and North West of the land. The claim that the site has locally significant beauty is not sustainable</p> <p>In neither case is the requirement that "the green space holds a particular significance" established.</p>		Noted. The process undertaken and reasons for proposed designation are set out in full in Local Green Space Report.
281	<p>The community consultation in 2016 failed to identify Street Farm for consideration and the decision by the Committee to nominate the land at a late stage raises questions about the process being followed. The process of site selection and evaluation undertaken by the Steering Committee is discussed further in a section below</p>		See above
282	<p>Response to public Consultation October/November 2018</p> <p>Point by point responses to the comments recorded from the public consultation in October/ November 2018 set down in the Local Green Space report are given in the table below - <i>SEE LOCAL GREEN SPACE REPORT FOR THIS TABLE and an aerial image of the space</i></p> <p>The general conclusion is that none of the comments and views made in the public consultation provide evidence that the field has particular significance and is special to the community. Many of the responses made could be made equally about the adjacent fields or other fields in the area.</p> <p>18 responses against LGS designation were recorded. This is between 3 and 10 times more than were recorded against any other nomination and is more than than the number who supported some of the other nominations. The number against is perhaps a reaction to the pressure applied to comment in favour of LGS by two of the Steering Committee members. This is described in the section on process below</p>		Noted. The reasons for the proposed designation are set out in full in the Local Green Space Report, and all comments received from the community during informal consultation on Local Green Space are included in Appendices 4 & 5 to the LGS report.

283	<p>Process</p> <p>We understand from the letter received from the Chairman of the Cam Parish Council on 30 November 2018 that the process followed by the NDP Steering Committee was to form a long list of all possible suitable open spaces. 41 possible green spaces were identified. The Street Farm land was not on this list even though it is a large tract of land (more than 1 hectare). This is in line with the fact that it is outside of the settlement development limit and is private land with no public access and already subject to restrictions from policies in the Stroud Local Plan. These factors would have been expected to screen it out from further consideration.</p> <p>The criteria used for shortlisting from the long list are not completely clear but resulted in the original list being reduced. We understood that it was reduced to 6 but the letter from the Chairman of the Council asserts that it was 12.</p> <p>Sometime afterwards much to our surprise the Street Farm field was added to the list. 3 other parcels of land were added to the shortlist over time. These three were all open public spaces and relatively small so perhaps arguably easier to miss in the long listing process.</p> <p>The addition of the SF field is a consequence of the actions of two members of the Steering Committee who joined the committee after the initial listing and evaluation process had been completed. Janice Evans lives in one of the 4 houses in Springfields Old Court that back onto the Street Farm field. Moira Woodward lives nearby in Springhill. Janice Evans and Moira Woodward led a vitriolic and personal campaign to stop approval being given when planning permission was sought on the Street Farm land in 2014. They, along with Keith Scott, also a member of the Steering Committee, are specifically mentioned as witnesses in the Appeal Inspector report (APP/C1625/W/15/31395860).</p> <p>In her zeal to ensure that nothing is built anywhere near her house, Janice Evans, supported by Moira Woodward, has been vocal in pushing for the Street Farm field to be added to the list of proposed green spaces. When asked directly, Mr Gowcutt, the chairman of the Steering Committee, has been unable to confirm that Janice Griffiths and Moira Woodward had been excluded from discussions of matters regarding Street Farm. The letter received from the Chairman of Cam Council on 30 November 2018 similarly does not confirm that they were not</p>		<p>The Process undertaken to arrive at the proposed Local Green Spaces is clearly outlined in Section 2 of the Local Green Space Report. This has been further clarified in the Regulation 15 version of the Report. The initial list that was drawn up at the beginning of the NDP process was reviewed in Spring 2018 to ensure that all spaces being considered at the time were potentially appropriate for designation. Some spaces, including Street Farm Field, were considered during this time and added to the list for consideration.</p>
284	<p>allowed to influence the committee.</p> <p>Whilst as Committee Members they should have stayed neutral, both ladies have been active in seeking comments from local residents to support their aim of securing a LGS nomination for the SF field.</p> <p>We understand the required protocol for the creation of a Neighbourhood Plan is the same as that expected in putting together a District Plan regarding involvement of those with a vested interest. This protocol has not been followed and for this reason alone the nomination of the SF field for LGS designation is seriously flawed and we believe should be withdrawn.</p> <p>The definition of the boundaries of the land suggested for designation appears arbitrary. The land selected is a contiguous part of a much larger area of land to the east, west and to a small degree to the north, all of which is outside of the settlement development limit. This single larger parcel of land was labelled Area A by Potterton Associates in their Landscape Sensitivity report and considered as a single piece of land. The nomination of part of the SF land appears illogical and unsupported.</p>		<p>See above</p>

285		<p>The SF land is outside of the settlement development limit and subject to the relevant policies in the Stroud District Local Plan. Policy CP15 contains policies for the protection of the beauty of the countryside and only supports development in very special circumstances. The rejection of a planning application on the SF field and, support for this rejection at a subsequent Appeal in 2016 specifically because it does not satisfy the conditions for development included in CP15, provides evidence that adequate protection for the land is in place. The PROWs across the land are also protected by legislation. We do not believe that a defensible case has been made by the Steering Committee that our land should be singled out for LGS designation. However even if this were the case it is adequately protected by the policies of the SDC Local Plan.</p> <p>More generally it is clear that a methodology with clear criteria that show the nominations are 'demonstrably special' and fit the Cam Vision, with evidence assembled which shows this is the case has not been in place. The nomination process of the SF land appears to be driven by the strong views of two members of the committee. Evidence that the land satisfies the requirements of the NPPF PPG has been provided - comments from local residents do not of themselves provide the evidence required to satisfy the requirements of the NPPF PPG.</p> <p>We suggest that the nomination and evaluation of our land as an LGS did not arise from a proper process but was in fact driven by the vested interests of two members of the Steering Committee and that its designation is open to challenge.</p> <p>We continue to object strongly to the nomination of our land as a LGS and are disappointed that a transparent fair process has not been followed.</p>		<p>Noted. The SG considers that the evidence collected demonstrates that Street Farm Field is demonstrably special to the community that and additional local benefit would be gained (over its existing policy protection afforded by the Stroud Local Plan) by its designation as a Local Green Space. More detail in Local Green Space Report.</p>
286		<p>Conclusions</p> <p>The process adopted by Cam NDP Steering Committee to identify and select spaces for nomination as a LGS has not followed a robust independent methodology with clear criteria for determining whether the land has a particular significance.</p> <p>SF is private land with no general public access. No evidence has been presented that the area has characteristics which make it demonstrably special. Public consultation has attracted more people against the nomination than any other LGS nomination in Cam, indeed more than are in favour of some of the other nominations. Many of the comments made in response to the 2018 consultation could be made equally for several areas of land nearby and have not demonstrated that the SF land is special to the community. The selection of the SF land itself appears arbitrary. The boundary could equally have included the field to the east... and the field beyond that.</p> <p>Both the nomination by the Steering Committee and the public consultation have been heavily influenced by two members of the Steering Committee with a vested interest. The garden of one of these ladies abuts the SF field. Both have a history of vitriolic objection to a previous planning application made in 2014 and have been zealous in seeking support for the nomination of the SF field. Their influence on the deliberations of the Steering Committee do not align with the proberty expected of a properly constituted Committee of Cam Parish Council charged with acting for the common good. The validity of the LGS nomination and its evaluation are very questionable</p> <p>The rights of way across the land are protected by legislation and the land is protected by the policies in the Stroud Local Plan as it is outside of the Settlement Development Limit. This protection is long lasting. The rejection of a planning application both by Stroud District Council and on Appeal (in 2016) evidences that the land is in any case not in need of any further protection.</p>		<p>Noted. Points covered in this letter are incorporated in the Local Green Space Report.</p>

287	Local Green Space Report and Policy CAMCF2	<p>I am writing on behalf of my clients Mrs Wendy Ghaffar and Mr Ian Harris in relation to the above Regulation 14 Consultation. Specifically, I am writing in response to proposed policy CAMCF2 Local Green Spaces, together with the evidence document Local Green Space Report Draft and appendices. As set out in my letter to you dated 14th January 2019, my clients own the land proposed as a Local Green Space identified under Policy CAMCF2 as site LGS10 Riverside, land at Everlands. My clients maintain their objection to this proposed allocation on their land for the reasons given in my previous letter.</p> <p>I note that the draft version of the Neighbourhood Plan proposes to allocate this land at Everlands but it does not provide a response to the observations raised in my letter. I have reviewed the relevant documents for this consultation, and I note that the Local Green Spaces Report provides the evidence base for policy CAMCF2. This contains a large amount of information based on questionnaires carried out in 2016 and again in 2018/19. Whilst the views and wishes of residents are valuable, I wish to take this opportunity to remind the Parish Council that the Neighbourhood Plan should also be based on factual information and empirical evidence.</p> <p>Concerningly, the methodology for the selection of local green spaces in the Green Spaces Report appears to be based on the quantity of supportive comments in the questionnaires, without any assessment of their accuracy of factual validity. It seems to me that the Council have simply counted the number of supportive responses with a brief summary as providing the justification for the site's allocation against paragraph 100 of the NPPF. In opinion this is unsound plan-making and is the reason why I have sent a copy of this letter to the Neighbourhood Planning Officer at Stroud District Council. To demonstrate my point, I have myself undertaken a brief analysis of the online questionnaire responses to 2018/19 which are provided at Appendix 4 of the Green Spaces Report in response to the proposed Everlands site.</p>		<p>Noted. The points raised in this letter are incorporated in the Local Green Space Report. It is considered that the methodology used to arrive at the proposed Local Green Spaces is robust and follows the methodology used elsewhere for analysis of Local Green Space evidence collected as part of Neighbourhood Plans. As noted, the views and wishes of residents are valuable and these constitute a proportion of the evidence base which supports the proposed designation of all Local Green Spaces.</p>
288	Local Green Space Report and Policy CAMCF2	<p>Beauty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Riverbanks -Oak trees -General benefit of green space, well being -Wider benefits to the town -Walking along the riverside <p>The above comments are based on a fundamental misunderstanding that the land is publicly accessible. Whilst a public footpath crosses the land, this does not run parallel with the river bank, nor does it include the majority of the site to the north. Additionally, the landowners have stated that there are only four oak trees on the site and these are located close to the public right of way at the site's southern end.</p>		<p>Noted. See above. Description of space and evidence section amended to remove reference to riverside walk</p>
289	Local Green Space Report and Policy CAMCF2	<p>Historic Significance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The line of the old Dursley Donkey railway used to run along the edge of the land -The Oak Trees have historic significance -The former pedestrian bridge has historic significance <p>As pointed out in my previous correspondence in January, whilst the land may have included a railway line, this has now been subsumed by the landscape and provides no historical significance. Part of the former pedestrian bridge remains, but this is localized to a relatively small area in the southern part of the site. These are not sufficient factors to award the site any special significance.</p>		<p>Noted. See above. The SG considers that the space's relationship with the former railway line is special. More detail in the LGS Report.</p>

290	Local Green Space Report and Policy CAMCF2	<p>Recreational Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Dog Walking -Play area for children -Fishing -Blackberry picking -Wildlife Watching -Used to be used for cricket and football <p>Whilst the land may have been publicly accessible in the past that is no longer the case. In my view therefore the above recreational activities are therefore no longer possible without the consent of the my clients as the landowners. (Indeed, the landowners have no recollection of either football or cricket being played there in living memory).</p>		Noted. The summary of the space's recreational value (as evidenced in pre-regulation and regulation 14 consultation) has been amended accordingly.
291	Local Green Space Report and Policy CAMCF2	<p>Tranquility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Shading of trees -Sound of the river -Acts as a buffer between suburban development <p>Whilst the site has a tranquility to it that contrasts with the surrounding build up areas, these respondents fundamentally misunderstand that a local green space designation is not intended to be a land use tool to achieve spatial separation, such as Green Belt.</p>		Noted. See above. The SG consider that the space is special due to its tranquil nature. More detail in the LGS Report.
292	Local Green Space Report and Policy CAMCF2	<p>Wildlife</p> <p>According to the questionnaire responses, the following have been observed by residents within the site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -birds -deer -fish -bats -owls -kestrels -foxes -badgers -otters -herons -toads -squirrels <p>However, there is no empirical evidence to support these claims as no survey of the land has been carried out. Whilst these species may have been seen on the land, there is no evidence that the site provides any long term habitat for these animals.</p>		<p>Noted. The SG considers this space special due to its richness of wildlife. The GCER Distribution of Rare and Protected Species Records Map (April 2016) identifies sighting of a rare or protected species broadly located at the south and east boundary of the site.</p> <p>There are a number of notable trees within the space, three of which are marked on the historic map shown on the Woodland Trust's Ancient Tree Inventory and are therefore likely to be veteran or ancient trees. There is also a TPO Tree (TPO 299) within the space, just south of the PRoW.</p> <p>More detail in the LGS Report</p>
293	Local Green Space Report and Policy CAMCF2	<p>Conclusions</p> <p>Overall, having reviewed the Neighbourhood Plan evidence base for Local Green Spaces I am significantly concerned about the processes used to justify the Parish Council's site selections. These appear to be based on the number of supportive comments received irrespective of whether these comments are based upon fact or are consistent with paragraph 100 of the NPPF. In my view this is highly unscientific and unsound. Consequently, I have sent a copy of this letter to the Neighbourhood Plans Officer at Stroud District Council.</p>		<p>Noted. The points raised in this letter are incorporated in the Local Green Space Report.</p>
294	Policy CAMES1 - Green infrastructure and biodiversity.	<p>See long letter for full policy context outlined</p> <p>CAMES1 supports development proposals which demonstrate how Green Infrastructure networks and assets will be harnessed and enhanced. The policy would appear to function for the purpose of achieving environmental benefits from large-scale greenfield applications. However, as written the policy risks sweeping up all types of development proposals including change of use and small residential developments on brownfield sites.</p>	Whilst Gladman appreciate that GI improvements can be achieved via off-site contributions as well as on-site, the policy would benefit from the application of a threshold or the specification of which type of planning application the policy would apply to	The policy wording will be simplified. The policy requires all development proposals to consider its impact on green infrastructure and biodiversity in Cam Parish, so it is not considered necessary to include a threshold or specification.

295	Policy CAMES2	<p>CAMES2 restricts development at locations which contribute to the setting of the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, as identified in the Cam Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (2018). This identical document outlines the following definition, but does not identify a boundary for the setting: <i>The Board considers the setting of the Cotswold AONB to be the area within which development and land management proposals, by virtue of their nature, size, scale, siting materials or design can be considered to have an impact, positive or negative, on the landscape, scenic beauty and special qualities of the Cotswold AONB.</i></p> <p>Whilst we appreciate that the Cotswold AONB Board defines the setting of the AONB as the above, there is no map in the evidence base which marks out any such boundary. Gladman would dispute that a defined setting can be attributed to the AONB in this or any other location. A similar argument was put forward by residents against the residential development on Bath Road, Leonard Stanley which sits below the Cotswold escarpment and is also part of the AONB.</p> <p>In that case, the scheme was found at appeal (PINS ref: 2207324), to be set within the context of the existing built-up area and was therefore allowed. Clearly, each planning application is, and should be, decided on a case by case basis. However, it is noted that the 'setting' which is labelled on the CNP Figure 8, but is still not delineated, would likely be subject to intervening vegetation, buildings, contours and elevations. Furthermore, as in Leonard Stanley, new development would be seen within the context of the built-up area.</p>	<p>Clearly, each application should be accompanied by a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment, prepared with reference to the Cam Landscape Sensitivity Assessment and then, decided on the basis of the unique circumstances of the location. However, as written, the policy would contravene basic condition (e).</p>	Policy amended
296	Policy CAMES3	<p>This policy identified 8 'valued views' which the plan makers consider are important for the setting and character of Cam. Identified views must be supported by evidence and ensure that they demonstrate a physical attribute elevating a view's importance beyond simply being a nice view of open countryside. The evidence base to support the policy does little to indicate why these views are important any why they should be protected, other than providing a view of the surrounding fields and woodland. It therefore lacks the proportionate and robust evidence required by the PPG.</p> <p>In addition, as set out in case law (Stroud DC V SoS for Communities and Local Government [2015] EWHC 488; paras 13-16,18), to be valued, a view would need to have some form of physical attribute. This policy must allow a decision maker to come to a view as to whether particular locations contain physical attributes that would 'take it out of the ordinary' rather than selecting views which may not have any landscape significance and are based solely on community support.</p> <p><i>Opinions on landscape are highly subjective, therefore, without robust evidence...</i></p>	<p>We submit that new development can often be location in areas without eroding the views considered to be important to the local community and can be appropriately designed to take into consideration the wider landscape features of a surrounding area to provide new vistas and views.</p> <p>Gladman therefore suggests this element of the policy is deleted as it does not provide clarity and support for a decision maker to apply the policy predictably and with confidence. It is therefore contrary to paragraph 16(d) of the Framework and basic conditions (a) and (d)</p>	Policy has been amended. Revised policy seeks to ensure that proposals, through the planning application submission, assess the impact of their proposals on identified locally valued view(s) and demonstrate how proposals would alter the view.

297	Policy CAMCF2	<p>This policy seeks to designate ten parcels of land as Local Green Space (LGS). In order to designate land as LGS the Parish Council must ensure that it is able to demonstrate robust evidence to meet national policy requirements as set out in the Framework. The Framework makes clear at §99 that the role of local communities seeking to designate land as LGS should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development.</p> <p>§99 states that:</p> <p><i>'The designation of land as Local Green Space through local and neighbourhood plans allows communities to identify and protect green areas of particular importance to them. Designating land as Local Green Space should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or updated, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.'</i></p> <p>Further guidance is provided at § 100 which sets out three tests that must be met for the designation of LGS and states that:</p> <p><i>'The Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;</i> <i>b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and</i> <i>c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.'</i> <p>The requirements of the Framework are supplemented by the advice and guidance contained in the PPG. Gladman note §007 of the PPG8 which states,</p> <p><i>'Designating any Local Green Space will need to be consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. In particular, plans must identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs and the Local Green Space designation should not be used in a way that undermines this aim of plan making.'</i></p>		Noted
298		<p>Gladman further note §015 of the PPG (ID37-015) which states, '§ 100 of the National Planning Policy Framework is clear that Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green area concerned is not an extensive tract of land. Consequently, blanket designation of open countryside adjacent to settlements will not be appropriate. In particular, designation should not be proposed as a 'back door' way to try to achieve what would amount to a new area of Green Belt by another name.'</p> <p>Designation of LGS should not be used as a mechanism to designate new areas of Green Belt (or similar), as the designation of Green Belt is inherently different and must meet a set of stringent tests for its allocation (§ 135 to 139 of the Framework).</p> <p>Gladman do not believe that CNP supporting evidence is sufficiently robust to justify the proposed allocation of LGS8 - Littlecombe Meadow and LGS9 - Street Farm Field as LGS, given their lack of particularly special features.</p> <p>The issue of whether LGS meets the criteria for designation has been explored in a number of Examiner's Reports across the country and we highlight the following decisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Sedlescombe Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Report recommended the deletion of an LGS measuring approximately 4.5ha as it was found to be an extensive tract of land. 		See above

299		<p>- The Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan Examiners Report recommended the deletion of an LGS measuring approximately 5ha and also found this area to be not local in character. Thereby failing to meet 2 of the 3 tests for LGS designation.</p> <p>- The Alrewas Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Report identifies both proposed LGS sites 'in relation to the overall size of the Alrewas Village' to be extensive tracts of land. The Examiner in this instance recommended the deletion of the proposed LGSs which measured approximately 2.4ha and 3.7ha.</p> <p>Highlighted through a number of Examiner's Reports set out above and other 'made' neighbourhood plans, it is considered sites LGS8 and LGS9 have not been designated in accordance with national policy and guidance and subsequently are not in accordance with the basic conditions.</p> <p>Whilst the Parish Council have sought to undertake some form of evidence base it does not overcome the failure to meet the specific policy requirements set out above with regards to the scale of land to be designated. In terms of meeting the second test there is no evidence base to support all designated LGSs being 'demonstrably special to a local community.' In relation to their beauty, most are of no particular scenic quality and have not been made in accordance with basic conditions (a) and (d).</p>	<p>Gladman therefore recommend that the LGS Policy be revisited to ensure the designations are compliant in their entirety.</p>	<p>It is considered that the interpretation of 'extensive tract of land' and 'local in character' depends on the context, size and function of the proposed Local Green Space. LGS8 and LGS9 are not considered extensive tracts of land are are considered local in character - see detail in Local Green Space Report.</p> <p>The evidence base, including justification for considering each proposed space as demonstrably special to the community, is included in Appendices 4,5, 12 and 13 to the Local Green Space Report, and summarised in Section 4 of the Report itself.</p>
300	General	<p>Gladman recognises the role of neighbourhood plans as a tool for local people to shape the development of their local community. However, it is clear from national guidance that these must be consistent with national planning policy and the strategic requirements for the wider authority area. Through this consultation response, Gladman has sought to clarify the relation of the CNP as currently proposed with the requirements of national planning policy and the strategic policies for the wider area. Gladman is concerned that the plan in its current form does not comply with basic condition (a) in its conformity with national policy and guidance and (d) the making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development for the reasons set out above and (e) is in general conformity with the strategic development plan policies. Gladman hopes you have found these representations helpful and constructive. If you have any questions do not hesitate to contact me or one of the Gladman team.</p>		<p>Noted - and thank you for the constructive comments. Appropriate amendments have been made to the Plan</p>
301	General	<p>Thank you for your Regulation 14 consultation on the Cam Parish Neighbourhood Plan. There are no issues associated with the Plan upon which we specifically wish to comment other than to highlight how pleased we are to note when communities value their distinctive local historic environment and promote policies and proposals for its protection and enhancement.</p> <p>Our congratulations to your community on its progress to date and our best wishes for the making of its Plan.</p>		<p>Noted with thanks</p>
302	P48 CAMCF2 LHS9	<p>This green space is the natural habitat for vast amounts of wildlife. It is also used regularly by ramblers and dog walkers</p>		<p>Noted, this comment is incorporated in LGS Report</p>

303	General	<p>Dear Sir.</p> <p>I am so sorry to miss the deadline for responses.</p> <p>I would like to see a speed reduction at Everlands.</p> <p>Currently there are mini speed humps that unfortunately do not slow the traffic down. The speed humps should be higher and to spread the whole width of the road as you have in Manor avenue. This would deter heavy goods vehicles using the road, and slow down speeding motorists.</p> <p>Everlands is served by three schools, if nothing happens there is a accident waiting to happen.</p>		Speed restrictions are outside the scope of this plan
304	General	<p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>These representations are submitted on behalf of Persimmon Homes Severn Valley (PHSV).</p> <p>Having worked closely with other neighbourhood groups to ensure that Neighbourhood Plans meet the basic conditions and are therefore found to be sound through examination, PHSV would be pleased to engage positively with the Council to discuss the practical implications of such policies within and outside of the formal emerging planning policy consultation process.</p> <p>PHSV are supportive of neighbourhood planning, recognising that it enables local communities to direct growth and ensure that development seeks to reflect the particular special characteristics of their area. Neighbourhood Planning can be a daunting task for local communities who are understandably not commonly well versed in the complexities of the planning system as well as the web of regulations and law which set out the parameters within which policy must be drafted and the process through which it should emerge.</p> <p>With this in mind, PHSV hope to provide some constructive feedback on the Cam Neighbourhood Plan and the draft policies therein to not only ensure that the Plan meets the basic conditions which will allow it to pass examination, but also to ensure that the requirements do not impact negatively on the future growth of Cam.</p>		Noted with thanks

305	General	<p>Paragraph 37 of the 2019 NPPF sets out that: "<i>Neighbourhood plans must meet certain 'basic conditions' and other legal requirements before they can come into force. These are tested through an independent examination before the neighbourhood plan may proceed to referendum.</i>" The basic conditions set out in Paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) are as follows:</p> <p>(2) A draft order meets the basic conditions if—</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>b) having special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses, it is appropriate to make the order,</p> <p>c) having special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area, 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, and</p> <p>g) prescribed conditions are met in relation to the order and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the order.</p> <p>As highlighted on page 16 of the Neighbourhood Plan, Stroud District Council are working on their Local Plan Review which is due to be submitted for examination in around December 2020. As part of the Local Plan Review, Stroud District Council are having to accommodate around a 40% increase in their housing requirement over the period to 2036, over and above that which is currently planned for in the adopted Local Plan.</p>	<p>With this in mind, whilst we can appreciate that the neighbourhood group have put in a great deal of work on getting the Neighbourhood Plan to its current stage, there would be merit in pausing work on the Neighbourhood Plan until such time as the Local Plan Review is close to adoption. As Cam is identified as a location for strategic growth in the Local Plan Review, this would allow the Neighbourhood Plan to guide that future development which will almost certainly be identified through the Local Plan Review. Should the Neighbourhood Plan continue on its current course, reflecting the policies of the adopted Local Plan, it will to a large extent become out of date as soon as the Local Plan Review is adopted in 2021 as it will not reflect the growth which is being proposed for Cam.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, should the neighbourhood group wish to continue with the Neighbourhood Plan as it stands, within the context of the policies of the adopted Stroud Local Plan, we have the following comments on the document and its supporting evidence.</p>	Noted.
306	CAMCD2	<p>Draft Policy CAMCD2 seeks to address potential impacts on existing trees and hedgerows within Cam. In masterplanning, PHSV seek are aligned with the intentions of this policy, seeking to preserve existing trees and hedgerows where possible whilst also seeking to optimise the development potential of sites in as required by the NPPF. PHSV therefore supports the inclusion of Policy CAMCD2 however raise one issue with its current drafting. As drafted the policy states that "where there is an unavoidable loss of trees on site, replacement trees will be required to be planted on site at a rate of two trees for each tree lost. Species should be selected in line with advice set out in the Cam Design Code (2019)". Whilst we support this in principle, it does not give clarity or consider the practical considerations which can often be involved. For instance, the wording does not specify what size of tree could be captured by this policy or what standard of tree must replace any lost and as such in theory a sapling could be lost and this could end up requiring the replacement of 2 significant trees. When you consider the likely number of small, juvenile trees which could be lost on a site this could potentially have significant implications for optimising the development of a site as large areas would have to be provided for tree planting.</p> <p>It is also evident that this wording does not consider the quality of the trees being lost and the potential quality of the tree replacing it. For example it is feasible that there could be a great benefit in replacing ten poor quality trees with five high quality trees. This would not be a consideration under the current wording of the policy and as such the policy supports quantity over quality.</p>	<p>The wording could be amended as follows in order to give greater balance to quality over quantity:</p> <p><i>"Where there is an unavoidable loss of trees on site, replacement trees will be required to be planted on site at a rate of two trees for each tree lost. Consideration will be given to the quality of the trees proposed as replacements in order to assess the appropriate number of replacement trees required in relation to the quality of those being lost. Species should be selected in line with advice set out in the Cam Design Code (2019)"</i></p>	Many thanks for this detailed response and suggestion. Policy to be revised in line with comments.

307	CAMMC1	Draft Policy CAMMC1 deals with improving and enhancing connections for cyclists and pedestrians. PHSV support the inclusion of a policy which seeks to maximise the permeability of developments as well as ensuring positive connections to local transport corridors and hubs. The current drafting of the policy however has practical implications as it would currently likely require developments to carry out works to off site snickets which could in many instances be in third party ownership. Developers would therefore not be able to provide a contribution to the Council in order for them to carry out enhancement work on snickets off site as they may not be in Council ownership. PHSV supports the intention to ensure that developments connect to existing snickets but the current drafting by virtue of its wording potentially puts developments at threat of not being deliverable.	The wording should therefore be amended to reflect this issue and we provide an example below: "Where development proposals neighbour or affect existing snickets, these must be retained, and connected to the proposed development and enhanced . Where development proposals neighbour existing snickets, they should seek to connect to them ensuring permeability not only across the proposed development, but also therefore allowing continued permeability through the wider area "	Noted. Policy wording amended
307	Design Code	We support the inclusion of the Design Code and its focus around landscape driven design. Our only comments in relation to the Design Code relate to some of the more prescriptive requirements and their practical implications. Whilst the majority of the document gives guidance on the existing local vernacular, there are some elements which require that developments meet certain prescriptive criteria. This presents issues as such specific criteria may not be possible within every development site due to site constraints based on for example topography or site shape. We would therefore propose that these prescriptive elements are amended as follows, to ensure that development is guided to reflect local vernacular, whilst still offering flexibility where the context of the site necessitates it (proposed amendments in red...):		Noted
309	Design Code P.14		The width of the snicket should be sufficient to provide habitats, wildlife routeways and surfaces for people. Where feasible the surface for people should be between 1.5 - 2 metres or 3 metres if dual use with a bike.	Agreed. Wording within the Code will be reviewed in line with this comment
310	Design Code P.16	Different trees have different growth characteristics. Site context may mean that a 2 metre wide verge is not possible in certain locations on a site but this amendment would allow for a narrower width in that location to reflect a tree species which is suitable.	Verges should be at least 2 metres suitably wide to enable tree growth specific to the tree planting in that location without impinging on highway and footway access.	Agreed. Wording within the Code will be reviewed in line with this comment
311	Design Code P21	This requirement may not be feasible in all locations where a neighbourhood is accessed. Access to sites is intrinsically tied up in its context and there will be cases where the landownership requires that the frontage of a site onto an existing highway will need to be used in its entirety to provide a safe access. In such situations it is likely that such a requirement would then require land take from a landowner who is not willing to give up an element of their land. It also risks planting feature trees in such a situation which would compromise the safety of those road users in that location due to the impact on visibility splays. This amendment will give flexibility that the landmark feature need not be located at the access but could be set back within the site a suitable distance from the access where it is feasible.	Where feasible , G gateways into Cam and into Cam's neighbourhoods should be defined by grassed junction islands or verges with a rural character that contains a landmark tree or tree group	Agreed. Wording within the Code will be reviewed in line with this comment

312	Design Code P24	It is not common that planning applications are supported by landscape designs that detail the planting in rear gardens of the plots proposed. Planting schemes generally deal with the public open space, communal areas and front garden areas around driveways and parking. The reason for this is that rear gardens are the main amenity areas of future occupiers and as such they prefer to have a blank canvass within which to create a space which is subjectively of their taste and allows them to have a private amenity area which gives them the most enjoyment. There are also issues around the ability to stop future occupiers from simply removing trees once they occupy their home. Adding tree planting can therefore add an unnecessary cost to a future occupier in removing trees and re- landscaping that space.	Where space allows, plant appropriate species of trees within rear plots. This is of particular value at the ends of exposed terraces and in boundaries between plots.	Agreed. Wording within the Code will be reviewed in line with this comment
313	Design Code P29	As set out within the Design Code and within the Design Statement forming part of the evidence base, there are varied building lines throughout Cam. It is important to remove this prescriptive 3 metre requirement as it would not allow flexibility where it may not be feasible to set buildings back by 3 metres or where it is preferable from a design point of view not to set buildings back by 3 metres. For example, it may be preferable from a design point of view to have car parking to the side of homes and the building line closer to the highway on both sides of the road through a development at certain specific points in order to create a sense of narrowing in the built form which will naturally act as traffic calming in those locations, rather than having to add such retrospective design elements as speed bumps. A varied street scene and the characteristics of the built form as a way of slowing vehicle movements through a development is a key component of the Manual for Streets design guidance.	Facades on varied building lines, set back from the highway by at least 3 meters	Agreed. Wording within the Code will be reviewed in line with this comment
314	Design Code P29	It is unclear what is meant by "building blocks" and this should be made clearer. In any case, should this mean that detached homes have to be separated by at least 3 metres this is not compliant with paragraph 123 of the NPPF which states that "where there is an existing or anticipated shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs, it is especially important that planning policies and decisions avoid homes being built at low densities, and ensure that developments make optimal use of the potential of each site". There are many successful estate designs which include shorter separation between buildings than 3 metres, providing detached homes in certain locations of a scheme whilst also maximising the sites potential in a context where we are asked to significantly boost the supply of housing.	A minimum 3 metre separation between building blocks.	Agreed. Some of the wording within the Code will be reviewed in line with this comment
315	Design Code P30	We believe this is stipulating that where a hedgerow boundary to a site would have housing and the gardens of them backing on to that boundary, there must be a separation between that boundary hedge and the back garden of the homes of at least 2 metres. Whilst we appreciate the intentions of this requirement to provide some formalised management control over retaining this hedgerow boundaries, in reality this is impractical. Issues arise regarding maintenance and control of the buffer and it is common that in such situations, within time, those occupiers who have a home backing on to the buffer will incorporate that element of the buffer into their curtilage. It also raises security issues with an access strip to the rear of homes which is lacking in surveillance and providing discreet access to those homes.	Separated from individual building plot rear boundaries by a buffer and maintenance strip of 2m minimum width	A positive, green edge between the built settlement and the landscape will be retained in the revised draft.

316	Design Code P31	<p>This seems to suggest that 2.5 and 3 storey homes will be resisted in new development within Cam. As the paragraph notes, there are examples within Cam of 2.5 and 3 storey homes, it is also evident as noted above that paragraph 123 of the NPPF which seeks to optimise the potential of sites. In the context of such a critical need for further housing within the District, 2.5 storey homes can be pivotal in optimising the potential of sites to deliver larger family homes at a more affordable price. On sites where there is varied topography, the use of 2.5 storey and 3 storey homes on lower parts of the site can offset the need to locate no or lower height development on areas of the site which are higher and therefore have the potential for greater landscape impact. Removing this sentence will ensure that the Design Code is compliant with the NPPF and allows flexibility.</p>	<p><i>Ambient building height is between one and two storeys across the village. However, there are a small number of 2.5 and 3 storey buildings both historic and in Cam's 20th Century neighbourhoods. These present exceptional opportunities to exceed the ambient height where there is a clear townscape case and no harm to amenity or village setting.</i></p>	<p>Wording reviewed, but it remains the case that the ambient height is between 1 and 2 storeys. Acknowledged that some flexibility is needed in relation to topography.</p>
317	General	<p>These comments are intended to be constructive and PHSV would be pleased to enter into further discussions on these comments as well as the practical implications of draft policies. We consider that the proposed amendments we have set out will ensure that the Plan meets basic conditions (a) and (d) specifically and will enable to the Plan to proceed through examination on to referendum.</p> <p>We would appreciate being kept informed of any future consultations on the Neighbourhood Plan and any other planning policy documents.</p>		<p>Noted - and thank you for the constructive comments. Appropriate amendments have been made to the Plan</p>
318	General	<p>Thank you for your consultation on the Neighbourhood Development Plan, which was received on 6 June 2019.</p> <p>We have no comments to make at this stage.</p> <p>We do not offer detailed bespoke advice on policy but advise you ensure conformity with the local plan and refer to guidance within our area neighbourhood plan "proforma guidance". Notwithstanding the above, for example it is important that these plans offer robust confirmation that development is not impacted by flooding and that there is sufficient waste water infrastructure in place to accommodate growth.</p> <p>We would only make substantive further comments on the plan if it were seeking to allocate sites in Flood Zones 2 or 3 (the latter being used as the 100 year climate change extent). Where an 'ordinary watercourse' is present this would need to be assessed and demonstrated as part of the evidence base within a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) i.e. to inform the sequential testing of sites and appropriate / safe development.</p> <p>We would not, in the absence of specific sites allocated, offer a bespoke comment at this time. You are advised to utilise our attached area guidance and pro-forma which should assist you moving forward with your Plan.</p>		<p>Noted.</p>

319	Local Green Space Report and Policy CAMCF2	<p>We have received a letter of notification from Cam Parish Council that the land we own at Everlands, referred to in your letter as 'Riverside' has been nominated as a Local Green Space and included in the draft neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>We are writing again to express our objection to the proposal that the site at Everlands be nominated as a Local Green Space. We refer you also to the three letters sent to the council in November 2018, and the letter supporting our objection as set out in the letter from the Town and Country Planning Consultants, Mr Daniel Drayton in January of 2019.</p> <p>This week Mr Drayton has written a further letter to yourselves and Stroud District Council outlining concerns about the process followed in developing the Local Green Space report and subsequent plan. There is a clear lack of factual information and empirical evidence to support the nomination of our land. Mr Drayton did raise these concerns with Cam Parish Council back in January of this year but received no response to the specific concerns about the process followed.</p> <p>We would like to also draw your attention to some factual inaccuracies in the Local Green Space Report and outline these below. These need to be considered together with the comments in the letter from Mr Drayton in January and July of this year.</p>		Noted. Points covered in this letter are incorporated in the Local Green Space Report.
320	Local Green Space Report, p28	statement that the land is ' surrounded by residential development '. This is description is not entirely accurate. On one side of the land is the road known as Everland's and there are houses on the opposite side of the road, at the far end of the land is the St George's estate. The majority of one side of the land has adjoining fields and at one end of the land there is a further stretch of land that continues along the river Cam but has not been included in the proposal.		Noted, description of space amended accordingly.
321	Local Green Space Report, p29	<p>Pg. 29 describes the area as 'Demonstrably special to the local community'</p> <p>The assumption here, and in many of the public comments, seems to be that the public have right of access to this land. This is incorrect. The public only have a right of way across a short and narrow section of the land at the far end nearest to Church Road. This short footpath joins the road at Everland's and St Georges close. The footpath is not adjacent to the river. Any reference to a 'riverside' walk is misleading as there is no public right of way along the river and indeed the land is somewhat overgrown limiting anyone walking beside the river.</p>		Noted. Description of space and evidence section amended to remove reference to riverside walk
322	Local Green Space Report, p29	<p>Pg. 29 'Beauty' This section of the report refers to 'ancient oak trees'. In the next section (historic significance) it states that; 'oak trees are remnants of Berkeley estate parklands'.</p> <p>Again, this is somewhat misleading. To be clear there are two old oak trees at the far end of the land next to the public footpath. It is surprising that such misleading information is included in what should be a clear and objective report and it is not clear where this information has come from. The suggestion that the trees are 'remnants of estate parklands' is not supported by evidence. This illustrates Mr Drayton's point about the lack of objectivity and accountability in this report.</p>		Noted, description of space amended accordingly.

323	Local Green Space Report, p29	Pg. 29 'Recreation' All of this section is again misleading as this is private land and the only right of access is the very short footpath at one end of the land. There is reference in one of the public comments to the field being used for 'football and cricket' and 'fishing'. In 40 years, we have not seen anyone fishing on our land and the ground is overgrown and uneven and unsuitable for cricket or football. It is possible that the submission's reference to football and cricket has confused our land with that of the recreational field in Everland's.		Noted, reference to cricket and football has been removed from this section.
324	Local Green Space Report, p29	Pg. 29 'Wildlife' Reference to wildlife appears to be based on subjective comments. There is no objective evidence base to support these claims. Indeed, having the land in the family for over 40 years we are not aware that most of the animals and birds referred to reside on our land. That is not to say they have not been seen, there is no way of knowing this. But to argue that this makes the site special is speculative as many of these birds and animal may also have been seen on adjoining land or other fields in the area. There is no evidence that these animals and birds live on or are dependent on the land.		Noted. The SG considers this space special due to its richness of wildlife. The GCER Distribution of Rare and Protected Species Records Map (April 2016) identifies sighting of a rare or protected species broadly located at the south and east boundary of the site. There are a number of notable trees within the space, three of which are marked on the historic map shown on the Woodland Trust's Ancient Tree Inventory and are therefore likely to be veteran or ancient trees. There is also a TPO Tree (TPO 299) within the space, just south of the PRoW. More detail in the LGS Report.
325		<p>In summary we do not agree that sound or sufficiently objective evidence has been presented to justify proposing the land we own at Everland's to become a Local Green Space, and as Mr Drayton has set out in his letter serious concerns about a failure to follow the appropriate process.</p> <p>The National Planning Framework clearly stipulates that; 'The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open spaces'. The case has not been made as to why this piece of land could be considered as 'special'.</p> <p>As landowners we would like reassurance that no one with a particular interest in this piece of land has been involved in the decision-making process so far and that all decisions have been made purely on factual and objective evidence.</p> <p>We continue to strongly object to this proposal,</p>		<p>Noted. The SG considers that the evidence collected demonstrates that this space is demonstrably special to the community. The points raised in this letter are covered in the Local Green Space Report.</p> <p>The Process undertaken by the Steering Group to arrive at the proposed Local Green Spaces is clearly set out in Section 2 of the Local Green Space Report.</p>
326	Pg 21 POLICY CAMES1	<p>Severn Trent is supportive of policies to enhance and maintain biodiversity.</p> <p>We would also encourage you to include a policy to safeguard existing Land Drainage and ditches for development to ensure that any sustainable surface water outfalls are not lost for future growth.</p> <p>We recognise the multiple benefits blue-green infrastructure has in enhancing biodiversity and providing sustainable locations for surface water drainage in line with the Drainage Hierarchy as supported by Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 80. Such locations can coincide with SuDS for new developments which provide multiple benefits such as flood risk reduction, biodiversity and amenity value.</p>	<p>Alter POLICY CAMES1 to read Blue-Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity.</p> <p>We suggest you include the policy wording:</p> <p>'Development should where possible, create and enhance blue green corridors to protect watercourses, and their associated habitats from harm.'</p> <p>'The incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) into these blue green corridors can help to improve biodiversity and amenity, assisting with the delivery of the wider benefits of utilising SuDS.'</p>	Noted - policy wording revised. Reference to SuDs is made in the Cam Design Code to which a revised version of this policy links.

327	Pg 37 POLICY CAMCD3	<p>Severn Trent is supportive of the policy to support sustainable construction and design, particularly methods to encourage water use reduction and waste water management.</p> <p>We are supportive of building designs that include greywater recycling and rainwater harvesting.</p> <p>With regards to water resource efficiency Part G of Building Regulations specify that new homes must consume no more than 125 litres of water per person per day. We recommend you encourage developers to consider taking an approach of installing specifically designed water efficient fittings in all areas of the property rather than focus on the overall consumption of the property. This should help to achieve a lower overall consumption than the maximum volume specified in the Building Regulations.</p> <p>We recommend that in all cases you consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single flush siphon toilet cistern and those with a flush volume of 4 litres. • Showers designed to operate efficiently and with a maximum flow rate of 8 litres per minute. • Hand wash basin taps with low flow rates of 4 litres or less. • Water butts for external use in properties with gardens. 	<p>We recommend the inclusion of the following policy wordings:</p> <p>'Development proposals should demonstrate that the estimated consumption of wholesome water per dwelling is calculated in accordance with the methodology in the water efficiency calculator, should not exceed 110 litres/person/day.'</p> <p>'Developments should demonstrate that unless not reasonably practicable the site designs have included water re-use measures.'</p>	Noted - the policy wording has been reviewed and support for building designs that include grey water harvesting and recycling is included.
328		<p>Dear Sir / Madam</p> <p>Cam Neighbourhood Plan Consultation SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF NATIONAL GRID</p> <p>National Grid has appointed Wood to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regards to the above Neighbourhood Plan consultation.</p> <p>About National Grid</p> <p>National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (NGET) owns and maintains the electricity transmission system in England and Wales and National Grid Electricity System Operator (NGESO) operates the electricity transmission network across the UK. The energy is then distributed to the eight electricity distribution network operators across England, Wales and Scotland.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>National Grid previously owned part of the gas distribution system known as 'National Grid Gas Distribution limited (NNGDL). Since May 2018, NNGDL is now a separate entity called 'Cadent Gas'.</p> <p>To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect National Grid's assets.</p> <p>Specific Comments</p> <p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines.</p> <p>National Grid has identified that it has no record of such apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p>		Noted

329	<p>Please remember to consult National Grid on any Neighbourhood Plan Documents or site-specific proposals that could affect our infrastructure. We would be grateful if you could add our details shown below to your consultation database.</p> <p>Spencer Jefferies Development Liaison Officer, National Grid box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com National Grid House Warwick Technology Park Gallows Hill Warwick Warwickshire CV34 6DA</p> <p>I hope the above information is useful. If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me. Yours faithfully [via email] Lucy Bartley Consultant Town Planner</p>		Noted
-----	--	--	-------