

A brief history to RA1 status for Cameley Parish Council

1. In October 2009, BANES published a consultation booklet “Core Strategy”
2. It set out its proposals for the period up to 2026 on a district wide basis.
3. Chapter 7 of the document was entitled “Spatial Options for Rural areas” and it tried to identify sustainable villages as distinct from smaller, more dependent villages and larger settlements which were or had the facilities of small towns.
4. This later group became R (Rural) A class settlements, Option 1 and the next strata of villages became Option 2. Cameley did not feature in either list.
5. To confuse the issue, most Option 2 villages were also categorised as Policy C settlements, but again did not include Cameley. C villages were identified as sustainable and having the capacity to act as “Hub” settlements for smaller villages and hamlets around them. They had been selected by results of the “facilities audit”.
6. In paragraph 7.21 of the document it lists the key indicators of C villages. In terms of development it says C villages would have small scale, self contained and where local need had been demonstrated.
7. On the 4th November 2009 I attended a meeting at Keynsham Town Hall on behalf of the PC to hear the proposals. On the 06.11.2009 I produced a briefing note which was distributed to the all Councillors.
8. I noted at paragraph 4 of my document that a buzz word was “sustainability”. A number of speakers were from the Parishes: Some dealing with affordable housing to retain their young people, which in many ways had failed with their objectives. Some dealing with issues of losing the village shop and how the community came together to put it back.
9. In paragraph 9 I noted that it was clear money would not be spent on improving the A37.
10. At this point it was explained that: Bath was a policy A City, Keynsham, Norton Radstock are policy B towns and a number of villages were identified as policy C as per the consultation document. I noted “ ... (these would) act as community facility hubs, that have small scale housing allocations and that have increased opportunity for economic activity. In short, they will have inward investment from the council” Other villages would not be treated so favourable.
11. Later, the meeting leader suggested that Temple Cloud and Clutton be treated as one and he would consider this.
12. On the 11th January, I submitted a response to BANES which laid out why we should be a Category C village.

13. In February we re audited the Parish as the data held was wildly inaccurate.
14. On the 11th March there was a further meeting to discuss the Core Strategy and again I produced a report of that meeting. The headline fact is that BANES had up rated Cameley to a Category C village. This was the first we had heard of this.
15. On the 2nd December 2010 BANES agreed to the Core Strategy and on the 21.02.2011 at a Review meeting and the publication of Draft Core Strategy we found ourselves as an RA1 village this term superseding Category C .