

**THE PARISHES OF
LEIGH AND BRANSFORD
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
CONSULTATION STATEMENT**

March 2022

2022 to 2041



Leigh and Bransford Parish Council

CONTENTS

	Page No
1. Introduction	3
2. Background	3
3. Consultation:	3
3.1 Questionnaire	3
3.2 Regular Consultation	4
3.3 Drop in Meeting and Exhibition	4
3.4 Exhibition and Presentation	6
3.5 Landowner and Developer Consultations	6
3.6 Consultation about Community Projects	6
3.7 Housing Needs Survey	6
3.8 Regulation 14 Submission	6
Appendices:	
Appendix 1: Regulation 14 Consultation Letter and Response Form	8
Appendix 2: List of Statutory Consultees for Regulation 14 Consultation	12
Appendix 3: Response to Regulation 14 Consultation from Malvern Hills District Council	15
Appendix 4: Response to Regulation 14 Consultation from Other Consultees	76
Appendix 5: Extracts from Questionnaire	132

1.0 Introduction

1.1 This Consultation Statement has been prepared to accompany the Leigh and Bransford Neighbourhood Plan (LBNP). It has been prepared in accordance with Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, Regulation 15 (2).

A Consultation Statement is defined as a document that:

- a) contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;*
- b) explains how they were consulted;*
- c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and*
- d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.*

2.0 Background

2.1 A Parish Plan for Leigh and Bransford was published in April 2005. In 2012 there was a wish to update the Parish Plan and a group of parishioners and parish councillors was set up to carry out the task. Following a series of discussions it was decided to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan rather than a parish plan.

2.2 At a meeting on 22nd May 2012 Leigh and Bransford Parish Council decided to designate the combined parishes as a Neighbourhood Area. The parish council submitted an application to designate the parishes as a Neighbourhood Area in May 2013. The Neighbourhood Area was designated by MHDC at a meeting on 24th September 2013.

2.3 The Neighbourhood Planning Group began a period of information gathering, formal and informal, and also began to prepare a survey in the form of a Community Questionnaire. However, there were problems with resources and the group was suspended in August 2014, starting up again in June 2015.

3.0 Consultation

3.1 Questionnaire: It was decided that while informally gathering data the first task of the group should be to finalise and issue the questionnaire. The questionnaire was delivered by hand in September 2015 to every household in the combined parishes. Return envelopes were provided and there were also a number of drop-off locations. The questionnaire covered a range of topic headings:

- General Household Information
- Environment Development and Design
- Community Facilities
- Transport and Road Safety
- Vision for the Future

Some of the questions were “open”. These were obviously more difficult to collate but thought necessary to get a full range of opinions. In the event many of the responses trended. Other questions were Yes/No, or scored by preference. There were 213 responses; more than 25% of households. Results from the questionnaire were released topic by topic as collation progressed. The final report was issued in January 2016 and included on the parish council website.

Extracts from the blank questionnaire and collated version questionnaire are reproduced in Appendix 1

3.2 Regular Consultation

There have also been several streams of regular consultation:

- The LBNP is a recurring agenda item for monthly parish council meetings. All meetings are open to the public. The minutes of all meetings are on the parish council website.
- Regular updates are included in The Sphere, a monthly parish magazine covering four local parishes, two of which are Leigh and Bransford.
- Presentations about the LBNP were made at the Annual Parish Meetings in May 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019.
- Throughout the process there has been regular consultation with officers of Malvern Hills District Council and with officers of Worcestershire County Council, particularly the HER, Archaeology, and Biodiversity groups.

3.3 Drop in Meeting and Exhibition

An informal draft of the LBNP was placed on the parish council website in June 2019. In order to receive feedback a drop in meeting and exhibition was held in Leigh and Bransford Primary School on Saturday 10th August 2019. The exhibition consisted of a number of plans, including the land identified in the South Worcestershire Councils “call for sites” as available for development, and posters with outlines of policies. Feedback forms were available in hard copy and on the parish council website, and feedback was used to inform the process of amending the draft Regulation 14 LBNP.

Every household in the combined parishes were informed of the meeting by hand delivered posters, a copy of which follows.

LEIGH AND BRANSFORD PARISH COUNCIL
NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
YOUR OPINION COUNTS



The draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) is now on the Parish Council website. (<http://www.leighandbransford.org.uk/parish-council/neighbourhood-plan/>)

We need your views!

An exhibition and public meeting will be held at
Leigh and Bransford Primary School
Saturday 10th August 2019: 2pm – 6pm

A neighbourhood plan relates to the use and development of land. The primary purpose of this NDP is to provide policies for the determination of planning applications in the parishes of Leigh and Bransford. If adopted, the NDP will form part of the development plan and sit alongside the Local Plan (the South Worcestershire Development Plan) prepared by the South Worcestershire Councils. Your feedback and comments are needed to make this Plan complete. In compiling the NDP we have used the responses to the September 2015 Questionnaire. This can be found on the Parish Council Website: <http://www.leighandbransford.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/NDP-Survey-Results.pdf>

There are a number of key issues.....but you may have more; please let us know!

- What form should any new development take place?
- Where should any new development be situated ...centrally, or extend existing built area?
- Should the Significant Gap be protected?
- What community facilities are needed....recreation and sports areas, village green, meeting/ community rooms etc? Can they be combined with new developments?
- Are there any exceptional views to, or from, the Neighbourhood Area that should be protected? (See para 5.3.6 of the NDP)
- Are there any Local Green Spaces that should be protected? (See para 5.3.7 of the NDP)

You can make your comments by email at:

ndp@leighandbransford.org.uk

or by post : Peter King, Spring Lodge, Stocks Lane, Leigh Sinton, Malvern, WR13 5DY.

We intend to publish comments and our responses. Please let us know whether you are a resident, resident landowner, landowner, developer. If you request we will not publish your name.

3.4 Exhibition and Presentation

The exhibition of 10th August was repeated at the parish council meeting on 27th August 2019, when there was also a formal presentation and Q and A session. Feedback forms were again available in hard copy and on the website, and feedback was used to inform the process of amending the draft LBNP.

3.5 Landowner and Developer Consultation

3.5.1 Meeting with landowner of Leigh Sinton Farms. Reference land in Leigh Sinton to the west of Malvern/Leigh Sinton Road (25th June 2018).

3.5.2 Teleconference meeting with Pegasus (developer) and their clients, reference land in Leigh Sinton to the east of Malvern/Leigh Sinton Road. (15th April 2020)

3.6 Consultation about Community Projects

3.6.1: An informal meeting to discuss Section 106 funding and community facilities was held at The Royal Oak, Leigh Sinton. Representatives of the Leigh and Bransford Scout Group, and the Leigh and Bransford Badgers Football Club attended. The Parish Council was represented. (17th July 2019)

3.6.2: PlanIt the representatives of the owners of land to the north of the A4103 in Leigh Sinton invited a number of organisations to discuss the community facilities that could be provided/ accommodated within the area proposed for development. In addition to the parish council attendees included Leigh and Bransford Badgers Football Club, Malvern Hills District Council S106 officer, Worcestershire FA development officer, Headteacher Leigh and Bransford Primary School.(8th December 2020)

3.7 Housing Needs Survey

The parish council commissioned a Housing Needs Survey (HNS) from South Worcestershire Councils, which was distributed in June 2021. The HNS contained additional questions about the types of facilities the community would like to see provided in the parishes.

3.8 Regulation 14 Neighbourhood Plan

Consultation on the draft LBNP was carried out in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. A Regulation 14 Neighbourhood Plan was published for comment on 3rd September 2021 with the six week period for consultation ending on 15th October 2021.

The publication of the draft LBNP for comment was publicised via the parish magazine (The Sphere) and by Facebook and email to local community groups, and by notices on parish council noticeboards. The Housing Needs Survey, delivered to every household, also gave advance notice.

Publication of the draft LBNP was also notified to a list of Statutory Consultees provided by MHDC (See Appendix 2). The list was extended by the parish council to include local organisations and landowners.

Hard copies of the Regulation 14 LBNP were available for collection at Leigh Sinton Post Office and The Fold Café at Bransford. It was also available on the parish council website. A feedback form was provided to all consultees who were contacted by email or post and was again available on the parish council website. Further hard copies were provided at Leigh Sinton Post Office and The Fold Café at Bransford.

Responses to the Regulation 14 LBNP from Malvern Hills District Council are in Appendix 3. All other responses are included in Appendix 4

APPENDIX 1: Regulation 14 Consultee Letter and Response Form

LEIGH AND BRANSFORD PARISH COUNCIL

Leigh and Bransford Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Pre-Submission

Dear Sir / Madam,

Leigh and Bransford Parish Council is preparing a Neighbourhood Plan in order to give the local community a stronger role in shaping where new development takes place in the parish and what new buildings should look like. Leigh and Bransford Parishes are in the Malvern Hills District, Worcestershire.

In accordance with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, Leigh and Bransford Parish Council is consulting on the draft Leigh and Bransford Neighbourhood Plan and inviting comments from 3rd September to 5:00pm on 15th October 2021.

The draft Plan includes 30 policies. There is a policy regarding the development of new housing, which also proposes a site for development to meet the Indicative housing requirement of the parish. Further policies seek to ensure that any new development is appropriately designed, provide a net gain in biodiversity, and protect the local heritage and landscape. The draft Plan also includes policies for Green Infrastructure, the protection of key views, proposes the designation of two new Local Green Spaces, infrastructure and energy, and amenities and well-being.

All comments received will be considered by Leigh and Bransford Parish Council and will help shape the final Neighbourhood Plan. The draft Leigh and Bransford Neighbourhood Plan, and Response Forms, are available on the Leigh and Bransford Parish Council website at <http://www.leighandbransford.org.uk/neighbourhood-plan-regulation-14-pre-submission-for-comment/>

Paper copies of the Neighbourhood Plan are also available at:

- Leigh Sinton Post Office: Hereford Road, Leigh Sinton, WR13 5DS
- The Fold Café: New House Farm, Hereford Road, Bransford, WR6 5JB

Comments on the draft Leigh and Bransford Neighbourhood Plan should be sent to Leigh and Bransford Parish Council **by 5pm on Friday 15th October** using the Response Form.

Comments can be emailed to ndp@leighandbransford.org.uk or sent by post to Mr Peter King, Spring Lodge, Stocks Lane, Leigh Sinton, Malvern, WR13 5DY.

If you have any queries or require further information about this consultation on the draft Leigh and Bransford Neighbourhood Plan please do not hesitate to contact me on 01886 832966.

Yours faithfully,

Peter King

Leigh and Bransford Parish Council.
Chair, Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

LEIGH AND BRANSFORD PARISH COUNCIL

Regulation 14 Pre-Submission

Leigh and Bransford Neighbourhood Plan

RESPONSE FORM

Under Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, Leigh and Bransford Parish Council is consulting on the draft Leigh and Bransford Neighbourhood Plan.

This consultation runs for six weeks from Friday 3rd September to 5:00pm on Friday 15th October 2021.

If you wish to comment on the draft Leigh and Bransford Neighbourhood Plan **please complete and return this form no later than 5:00 pm on Friday 15th October 2021 to:**

Email: ndp@leighandbransford.org.uk , or by

Post: Mr Peter King, Spring Lodge, Stocks Lane, Leigh Sinton., Malvern, WR13 5DY.

The personal information you provide on this form will be held and processed in accordance with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 2018 and the General Data Protection Regulation 2018.

Please note that your name and comments will be made publicly available when displaying the outcome of this consultation and cannot be treated as confidential. Any other details, including signatures, private telephone numbers and email addresses will not be published on the Parish Council's website. Your details will be retained in order for us to validate your comments. We will use these details to notify you of the progress on the Leigh and Bransford Neighbourhood Plan.

Please fill in your details in the boxes below:

Full Name:

Organisation (if applicable):

Address (including postcode):

Telephone number:

Email address:

Please state which part of the draft Neighbourhood Plan (i.e. which section, objective or policy) your representation refers to (please use a separate form for each representation):

Please use the space below to make comments on this part of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Please use a separate form for each representation.

Signature **Date**

Thank you for completing this form.

APPENDIX 2: List of Statutory Consultees Provided by Malvern Hills District Council

Publication of the draft LBNP was notified to a list of Statutory Consultees provided by MHDC. The list was extended by the parish council to include local organisations and landowners.

Consultation Bodies listed in Schedule 1 to the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012

1. For the purposes of regulations 14 and 16, a “consultation body” means	Consultation Body
(a) where the local planning authority is a London borough council, the Mayor of London;	Not applicable
(b) a local planning authority, county council or parish council any part of whose area is in or adjoins the area of the local planning authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Malvern Hills District Council • Wychavon District Council – • Worcester City Council – • Worcestershire County Council • Herefordshire Council <p>Parish Councils neighbouring the parish: Alfrick & Lulsley; Broadwas & Cotteridge; Rushwick; Powick; Newland; Malvern Town Cradley Worcestershire County Association of Local Councils Parish Councillors, District Councillors, County Councillor</p>
(c) the Coal Authority (1)	The Coal Authority
(d) the Homes and Communities Agency (2)	Homes & Community Agency
(e) Natural England (3)	Sustainable Development Consultation Team
(f) the Environment Agency (4)	Consultation Team
(g) the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (known as English Heritage) (5)	Historic England
(h) Network Rail Infrastructure Limited (company number 2904587)	<p>Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd</p> <p>Network Rail (Western Region)</p>

<p>(i) a strategic highways company (7) any part of whose area is in or adjoins the neighbourhood area; (ia) where the Secretary of State is the highway authority for any road in the area of a local planning authority any part of whose area is in or adjoins the neighbourhood area, the Secretary of State for Transport (6);]</p>	<p>Asset Manager - Highways Agency Floor 9, The Cube 199 Wharfside St Birmingham, B1 1RN</p>
<p>(j) the Marine Management Organisation (8)</p>	<p>Marine Management Organisation</p>
<p>(k i) any person to whom the electronic communications code applies by virtue of a direction given under section 106(3)(a) of the Communications Act 2003</p>	<p>BT</p>
<p>(k ii) any person who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus situated in any part of the area of the local planning authority</p>	<p>CTIL on behalf of Vodafone & Telefonica Virgin Superfast Worcestershire Vodaphone TalkTalk Three</p>
<p>(l i) where it exercises functions in any part of the neighbourhood area — a Primary Care Trust established under section 18 of the National Health Service Act 2006(7) or continued in existence by virtue of that section</p> <p>where it exercises functions in any part of the neighbourhood area - (i) a clinical commissioning group established under section 14D of the National Health Service Act 2006; (ia) the National Health Service Commissioning Board; (9)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NHS England, • NHS South Worcestershire Clinical Commissioning Group, • NHS, Planning and Partnership • Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust • Worcestershire Health & Care NHS Trust
<p>(l ii) where it exercises functions in any part of the neighbourhood area — a person to whom a licence has been granted under section 6(1)(b) and (c) of the Electricity Act 1989 (10);</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Grid • Western Power Distribution • E.ON UK • Npower • Wales and West Utilities • Scottish Power • EDF Energy
<p>(l iii) where it exercises functions in any part of the neighbourhood area — a person to whom a licence has been granted under section 7(2) of the Gas Act 1986 (11)</p>	<p>National Grid UK Gas Distribution</p>
<p>(l iv) where it exercises functions in any part of the neighbourhood area — a sewerage undertaker</p>	<p>Severn Trent Water</p>

(l v) where it exercises functions in any part of the neighbourhood area — a water undertaker	Severn Trent Water
(m) voluntary bodies some or all of whose activities benefit all or any part of the neighbourhood area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leigh and Bransford WI • Worcestershire Council for Voluntary Youth Services • Worcs Federation of WIs
(n) bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the neighbourhood area	
(o) bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the neighbourhood area	<p>Parochial Church Council</p> <p>Churches Together in Worcestershire</p> <p>Vicar for Leigh and Bransford</p>
(p) bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the neighbourhood area	<p>Worcestershire LEP</p> <p>Federation of Small Businesses (Herefordshire and Worcestershire)</p> <p>Herefordshire & Worcestershire Chamber of Commerce</p>
(q) bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the neighbourhood area	
Additionally, Planning Practice Guidance says: “Other public bodies, <u>landowners</u> and the <u>development industry</u> should be involved in preparing a draft neighbourhood plan or Order” .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local landowners • Developers with known local interests • Home Builders Federation • Malvern Hills AONB - • Worcester Diocese • The Crown Estate
Other potential interested or relevant bodies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE) • Forestry Commission • Herefordshire & Worcestershire Earth Heritage Trust • PSSC Canal & River Trust • Age UK Herefordshire & Worcestershire • Ancient Monuments Society • Sport England • Worcestershire Wildlife Trust • Leigh and Bransford Primary School • Friends of Leigh and Bransford Primary School • Leigh and Bransford Memorial Hall Committee • Leigh Sinton Community Group • Malvern Rise Planning group

APPENDIX 3: Response from Officers of Malvern Hills District Council

Leigh and Bransford Neighbourhood Development Plan

Regulation 14 Consultation

Malvern Hills District Council Officer Comments

October 2021

General Comments

As a context for our comments, the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (the Framework) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. In doing so, it sets out requirements for the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans and the role these should take in setting out policies for the local area. The requirements set out in the Framework have been supplemented by guidance contained in MHCLG's Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on Neighbourhood Planning.

The strategic planning policy framework for the Leigh and Bransford Neighbourhood Area is provided by the South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP) which was adopted in February 2016.

The housing requirement to 2030 in south Worcestershire is 28,370 dwellings. The SWDP makes provision for around 28,400 dwellings to meet this need. It should be noted that the South Worcestershire Councils have commenced a revision of the South Worcestershire Development Plan. The latest evidence of housing need is indicating that the revised SWDP (SWDPR) will need to plan for approximately an additional 14,000 dwellings across south Worcestershire in the period 2021 to 2041. The South Worcestershire Councils consulted on the SWDP Preferred Options between November and December 2019, including a proposed housing allocation in Leigh Sinton on land off the A4103 (site reference CFS0009) for 52 dwellings. The proposed site allocation also includes provision of a sports facility.

Whilst paragraph 70 of the Framework says that Neighbourhood Planning groups should consider the opportunities for allocating small and medium-sized sites suitable for housing in their area, the Framework does not require Neighbourhood Plans to allocate sites for housing. Paragraph 14 of the Framework does, however, confer a limited protection on Neighbourhood Plans which plan for housing where certain criteria are met. To benefit from the protection conferred by Paragraph 14 a Neighbourhood Plan would need to plan for housing through policies and allocations to meet the identified (or indicative) housing requirement in full, including possible allowance for some windfall development.

Following a request by Leigh and Bransford Parish Council, the South Worcestershire Councils provided indicative housing requirement figures for the Leigh and Bransford neighbourhood area in April 2020. The indicative housing requirement for the Neighbourhood Area for the period 2021 to 2030 was

1 dwelling (over-and-above existing allocations in the adopted SWDP). The indicative housing requirement for the Neighbourhood Area in the period 2031 to 2041 was a further 32 dwellings. It was highlighted that the housing requirement figures were “indicative”, should be considered as minimum requirements and may be subject to change, particularly as they were based on the current SWDP rather than the SWDPR.

PPG on Neighbourhood Planning includes the following guidance on what evidence is needed to support a Neighbourhood Plan and how Neighbourhood Plan policies should be drafted:

“Proportionate, robust evidence should support the choices made and the approach taken. The evidence should be drawn upon to explain succinctly the intention and rationale of the policies in the draft Neighbourhood Plan”.

“A policy in a Neighbourhood Plan should be clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence. It should be distinct to reflect and respond to the unique characteristics and planning context of the specific neighbourhood area for which it has been prepared”.

We would like to congratulate the Parish Council on preparing this Regulation 14 version of the Neighbourhood Plan.

We consider that the proposed housing allocation on land off the A4103 in Leigh Sinton (Policy LB/H5) for 52 dwellings would meet the indicative housing requirement for the Neighbourhood Area in full.

However, as currently worded we consider that some policies are not drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker could apply them consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It is also considered that some policies may need amending if they are to have regard to national policies or be in general conformity with strategic policies in the SWDP. To add clarity or ensure conformity with national or SWDP policies we have suggested alternative wording for some policies. These are only suggestions and it is obviously for the Parish Council or NDP Steering Group to decide which suggestions to accept.

Many of the draft policies list criteria that must be met in order for a development proposal to be supported. However, it is not always clear whether the applicant would need to meet one of the criteria or all of them. To provide sufficient clarity that a decision maker could apply the policies consistently and with confidence it should be made clear whether development proposals should meet “all” or “one or more” of the criteria to be supported.

Response: Policies amended where necessary

The issue that we consider needs most attention in the preparation of the next draft of the Neighbourhood Plan is the reasoned justifications to support policies. We consider that a number of policies currently lack proportionate, robust evidence to support the choices made and the approaches taken. In some cases, the supporting text does not appear to be directly relevant to the specific requirements of the proposed policy. In other cases, it appears that relevant and robust evidence may exist, but has not been drawn upon to explain the rationale for a policy. For example, the supporting text for Policy

LB/H/5 refers to a 2021 Housing Needs Survey, but the findings of the survey have not yet been drawn upon to inform Policy LB/H/5b. Similarly, the supporting text for Policy LB/HLB/9 refers to an “Ecological Search for Leigh & Bransford Neighbourhood Area”, but the findings of this report would probably be relevant to Policy LB/HLB/8.

It is noted that supporting maps for some policies are included under the reasoned justifications for other policies. For example, Map 9 (Farmsteads) is included under the reasoned justification for Policy LB/HLP/ 7 (Conservation Areas) rather than Policy LB/HLB/6 (Farmsteads and Agricultura Buildings).

Of more minor importance:

- The criteria for most policies are shown as a, b, c etc, but some are numbered 1, 2, 3 etc (eg Policy LB/IC/3). It is suggested that a consistent approach to listing criteria would be helpful.
- Most paragraphs in the Reasoned Justifications are numbered, but some are not. Consistent numbering of paragraphs is suggested.
- Currently, there are a lot of similarly numbered policies including LB/H/1, LB/D/1, LB/HLB1, LB/GI/1, LB/IRLCE/1, LB/IFD/1 and LB/AHWB/1. It is suggested that simplified policy numbering, eg Policies LB 1 to LB 31, might be helpful for decision makers. **Response: Simplified but not in one continuous list.**
- It is noted that a small number of policies have been worded to say that development proposals will be “considered favourably if ...”, whilst others say will be “supported if ...” It is suggested that a consistent phraseology would be helpful. **Response: Policies amended**

Contents

Page 4 - It is suggested that “Visions” be amended to “Vision” **Response: Amended as suggested**

Page 6 – It is suggested that Map 1 be amended to “Designated **Neighbourhood** Area for Leigh and Bransford NP” **Response: Amended as suggested**

Page 6 – It is suggested Map 2 be amended to “**Proposed** Site Allocation for ...” to reflect its current status. **Response: Amended as suggested**

Page 6 – Map 3a appears to be incomplete. Given that Map 3 shows the boundary of the Significant Gap, the purpose of Map 3a is unclear. **Response: Map 3a deleted**

For clarity and ease of reference it is suggested that the contents page include a list of NDP policies. **Response: List included in contents**

Executive Summary

Page 7, paragraph 2 – strictly speaking, the SWDP is “consistent with the NPPF” rather than conforms to it. **Response: Text amended**

Page 7, paragraph 5 – For accuracy, it is suggested that “... to meet the proposed allocation.” be replaced with “... to meet the indicative housing requirement.” **Response: Text amended**

1. Introduction

Paragraph 1.6 – It is suggested that “2021/2041” be replaced by “2021 – 2041”. **Response: Text amended as suggested**

Paragraph 1.8 – The relevance to community responses to a Cala Homes consultation in 2015 is not immediately clear. **Response: Text deleted.**

Paragraph 1.9 – For accuracy, it is suggested that the final sentence be amended to read “The emerging SWDP Review proposes a further allocation in the Neighbourhood Area” **Response: Text amended as suggested**

It is noted that the paragraph between 1.9 and 1.10 is unnumbered. **Response: Final version will be corrected**

Map 1 – For accuracy, it is suggested that the map title be amended to “Leigh and Bransford Designated **Neighbourhood** Area”. **Response: Text amended as suggested**

2. Neighbourhood Development Plans

Paragraph 2.1, sentence 5 – replace “The Local Plan for ...” with “The **Development** Plan for ...”: **Response: Text amended as suggested**

Paragraph 2.4, bullet point 5 – Insert “the designated **Neighbourhood** Area ...” **Response: Text amended as suggested**

Paragraph 2.4, bullet point 8 – It should be noted that the SEA / HRA Screening Opinion must be submitted with the Regulation 15 draft of the NDP. **Response: Noted**

The next steps – It is suggested that “MHDC appoint independent Examiner” precede “Consultation responses will be forwarded to the Examiner ...” **Response: Text amended as suggested**

Bullet point 5 – For clarity, it is suggested that “MHDC” be inserted before “Hold a referendum ...” **Response: Text amended as suggested**

3. General Background To Parish

Community Amenities – paragraph 3 – The list of amenities is included in Appendix F (not C). **Response: Text corrected**

Paragraph 3.16, final sentence – For accuracy, it is suggested that the sentence be amended to read “The SWDP Review has yet to be **examined or adopted.**” **Response: Text amended as suggested**

4. Visions and Objectives

Some references are made in the NDP to “Visions”, whilst other references are made to the “Vision”. It is suggested references to “visions” be replaced by “vision”. **Response: Text amended as suggested**

It is considered that some of the Objectives are quite disparate and not easily measurable. Whilst this would not prevent the NDP meeting the Basic Conditions, it may make it more difficult for the Parish Council to monitor the effectiveness of the NDP. **Response: Noted**

5. Policies and Justifications

Page 19, 2nd sentence – It is suggested that the word “main” is replaced by “relevant or linked”. **Response: Text amended as suggested**

Page 19, 3rd sentence – It is noted that Appendix A provides a cross reference between 11 NDP policies and the SWDP / NDP Objectives / Parish tasks. Appendix B lists Parish Council tasks. **Response: Text corrected**

5.1. Housing

Policy LB/H/1 - Leigh Sinton and Bransford Development Boundaries

New housing within the Leigh Sinton and Bransford Development Boundaries (as shown on Maps 4a and 4b) will be considered favourably if:

- a. It does not lead to the loss of community or recreation facilities, or local employment opportunities
- b. It accords with other relevant policies of the Leigh and Bransford Neighbourhood Plan and the South Worcestershire Development Plan.
- c. The existing Development Boundary in Leigh Sinton will be

Policy LB/H/1 has 2 parts.

Part 1 of Policy LB/H/1 (criteria c, d and e) proposes amended Development Boundaries for Leigh Sinton and Bransford (shown on Maps 4a and 4b on pages 32 and 33 respectively).

Part 2 of Policy LB/H/1 (criteria a and b) supports new residential development within the revised Leigh Sinton and Bransford development boundaries subject to meeting 2 criteria:

<p>extended as shown on Map 2 to include the site for housing allocation in Policy LB/H/5.</p> <p>d. Further extensions to the Leigh Sinton Development Boundary are proposed and indicated on Map 4a.</p> <p>e. A new Development Boundary is proposed for Bransford and is indicated on Map 4b.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accordance with other relevant policies in the SWDP and NDP, and • Not lead to the loss of community or recreation facilities, or local employment opportunities. <p>It is suggested that Policy LB/H/1 could be re-titled “New Residential Development within the Leigh Sinton and Bransford Development Boundaries” because the development boundary is a policy tool, not a policy. Also, the policy relates to housing, not other types of development within the development boundary. Response: Text amended as suggested</p> <p>In relation to Part 1 of Policy LB/H/1, the adopted SWDP identifies a development boundary for Leigh Sinton, but not for Bransford. The emerging SWDPR proposes revised development boundaries for both Leigh Sinton and Bransford.</p> <p>The Leigh & Bransford NDP seeks to update the existing / proposed development boundaries to include existing development or extant planning permissions co-terminous with the existing / proposed development boundaries. It is considered that the proposed update to the development boundaries generally applies the principles in the adopted SWDP and emerging SWDPR.</p> <p>However, whilst the proposed site allocation in Policy LB/H/5 would be co-terminous to the Leigh Sinton development boundary, the site allocation has yet to be tested at examination for either the NDP or SWDPR. In light of this, it may be premature to include the site in the revised development boundary at this stage. Response: Site removed from revised boundary</p> <p>In relation to Part 2 of Policy LB/H/1, if a development proposal is in accordance with other relevant policies in the SWDP and NDP, it is not clear why additionally it must not lead to the loss of community /</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>recreation facilities or local employment opportunities.</p> <p>To help decision makers apply Policy LB/H/1 consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications it is suggested that maps of the proposed development boundaries (currently Maps 4a and 4b) be included in Policy LB/H/1 rather than under the Reasoned Justification for Policy LB/H/5. Response: Maps moved in text.</p> <p>In general, it is considered that an amended Policy LB/H/1 would provide flexibility and support development within the development boundaries and, with the suggested amendments above, would be in general conformity with the strategic policy SWDP 2 (Development Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy). SWDP 2 focuses most development on the urban areas where both housing needs and accessibility to lower-cost public services are greatest. SWDP 2B says windfall development proposals will be assessed in accordance with the settlement hierarchy. Both Leigh Sinton and Bransford are identified as Category 3 settlements in the hierarchy. In relation to Category 3 villages SWDP 2B says infill development within the defined development boundaries is acceptable in principle subject to the more detailed Plan policies.</p>
<p>Policy LB/H/2 - Housing: Development in Open Countryside</p> <p>New housing development in open countryside, outside the amended Development Boundary (as shown on Maps 4a and 4b) will be considered favourably if:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. There is an essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside b. Affordable housing on an exception site is required to meet an identified local need. c. It is a replacement of an existing dwelling with established use rights and where the replacement dwelling does not exceed the 	<p>Policy LB/H/2 seeks to strictly control new development in the open countryside. The policy provides some flexibility for new development e.g. rural workers housing, rural exception sites and replacement dwellings.</p> <p>Paragraph 80 of the Framework says <i>“Planning policies and decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one or more of the following circumstances apply:</i></p> <p><i>a) there is an essential need for a rural worker, including those taking majority control of a farm business, to live permanently at or near their</i></p>

<p>original footprint by more than 30%</p> <p>d. It accords with other relevant policies of the Leigh and Bransford Neighbourhood Plan and the South Worcestershire Development Plan.</p>	<p><i>place of work in the countryside;</i></p> <p><i>b) the development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets;</i></p> <p><i>c) the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting;</i></p> <p><i>d) the development would involve the subdivision of an existing residential building; or</i></p> <p><i>e) the design is of exceptional quality, in that it:</i></p> <p><i>- is truly outstanding, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; and</i></p> <p><i>- would significantly enhance its immediate setting, and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area."</i></p> <p>To have regard to national policies it is considered that the Policy LB/H/2 should be amended to include the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It represents the represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets; or • It is truly outstanding, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; and would significantly enhance its immediate setting, and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area. Response: Text amended as suggested <p>In terms of re-use redundant or disused buildings and subdivision of an</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

existing residential building, it is noted that this is addressed separately in Policy LB/H3.

Currently, criteria a to d in LB/H/2 is a list which does not make clear whether an applicant would need to meet one of the criteria or all of them. To have regard to national planning policy it should be made clear that development proposals should meet “one or more” of the criteria to be supported. **Response: Text amended as suggested**

For clarity, it is considered that the word “amended” be deleted from the first sentence in Policy LB/H/2. The development boundary will be that which is adopted at the time. **Response: Text amended as suggested**

In relation to criterion (c), it is suggested that the wording be amended to read “The replacement is not disproportionately larger than the existing dwelling and will not exceed the existing gross internal floorspace by more than 30%.”. This is suggested because it is becoming increasingly difficult to calculate the original footprint of many older dwellings. **Response: Text amended as suggested**

It is considered that paragraphs 5.1.2 – 5.15 explain why limited development would be supported at Leigh Sinton and Bransford (Category 3 settlements) but does not explain the choices made and the approach taken in relation to Policy LB/H/2. It is suggested that the principal justification for Policy LB/H/2 is paragraph 80 of the Framework and Policies SWDP 2C, SWDP 16, SWDP 18 and SWDP 19. **Response: Text amended, refers to SWDP Policies**

Paragraph 5.1.4, sentence 3 – For accuracy, the 2019 Village Facilities and Rural Transport Study identified Leigh Sinton as a Category 3 settlement, not the SWDP Review. **Response: Noted, text amended**

Policy LB/H/3 - Extensions and Subdivisions

- a. Extensions to existing dwellings will be supported providing that they are subordinate to, and do not dominate the character and appearance of the original, or adjacent, dwellings.
- b. The subdivision of an existing residential dwelling will be supported providing that the development does not result in additional on-road car parking and does not have an adversely harmful impact on the area's visual amenity and landscape character.
- c. The conversion and re-use of redundant or disused buildings will be supported providing there is an enhancement to the building's immediate setting and there is no need for substantial reconstruction and large extensions.

Policy LB/H/3 supports extensions to existing dwellings, the subdivision of existing dwellings and the conversion and re-use of redundant or disused buildings, subject to certain criteria being met.

Policy LB/H/3 would apply both within and beyond the development boundary.

Parts (a) and (b) relate to existing dwellings, whilst (c) relates to disused buildings. For clarity, it is suggested that the policy be retitled "Extensions and Subdivisions of Existing Dwellings and Conversion and Re-Use of Redundant or Disused Buildings.

It is considered that parts (b) and (c) have regard to paragraph 80 of the Framework (which applies specifically to the open countryside).

It is noted that part (c) does not specifically say that conversion and re-use of redundant or disused buildings would only be supported for housing, but the policy is in the housing section. **Response:** Text now refers to dwellings It is suggested Policy LB/H/3 should make it clear what types of uses would be supported. As background, it should be noted that paragraph 84a of the Framework supports the conversion of existing buildings in rural areas to support the rural economy. The emerging SWDPR 23 also supports the reuse or conversion of redundant or disused rural buildings for housing, employment, tourism, recreation and community uses, subject to a number of criteria being met.

It is also considered that it would be helpful if any policy relating to the conversion and re-use of redundant or disused buildings included more detailed design guidance (eg respecting the character and significance of the original building), the need to have adequate access, access to existing utilities etc. **Response:** Text amended. In addition Policy LB/D/1 refers to

	<p>design requirements</p> <p>In light of the above it is suggested that the issues relating to the conversion and re-use of redundant or disused buildings may be different from extensions or subdivision of existing dwellings and may warrant a stand-alone policy. Response: Text amended, policies separated.</p> <p>It is suggested that the justification for part (c) of Policy LB/H/3 could be strengthened with reference to paragraph 80 of the Framework. Response: Text amended as suggested</p>
<p>Policy LB/H/4 - Significant Gap</p> <p>The Significant Gap between Malvern and Leigh Sinton will be retained in order to maintain the separation between Leigh Sinton and Malvern that protects their individual identities. The Gap protects the existing character of the area, including the views from and to the Malvern Hills (AONB). The Significant Gap is shown on Map3, and Map3a</p> <p>Acceptable developments may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The re-use of rural buildings; • Agricultural and forestry-related development; • Playing fields • Other open land uses that maintain the openness of the gap; and • Minor extensions to existing dwellings. 	<p>Policy LB/H/4 seeks to maintain the Significant Gap between Leigh Sinton and Malvern.</p> <p>Policy LB/H/4 helpfully sets out what types of development would be acceptable in the Significant Gap.</p> <p>In general, it is considered that Policy LB/H/4 is in general conformity with SWDP 2(D) which seeks to ensure the retention of the open character of the Significant Gap.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that only part of the Significant Gap is within the Neighbourhood Area and the Neighbourhood Plan can only address land use issues within the Neighbourhood Area. To address this, it is suggested that the policy be reworded along the lines of “The open character of the Significant Gap within the Neighbourhood Area (shown on Map 3) between Malvern and Leigh Sinton will be retained to provide a clear separation between Leigh Sinton and Malvern and protect their individual identities.”</p> <p>It is considered that the purpose of Map 3a is unclear. It is suggested that Map 3 be amended to clearly show that part of the Significant Gap which is within the Neighbourhood Area (covered by Policy LB/H/4) and that which</p>

	<p>is outside the Neighbourhood Area (not covered by the Neighbourhood Plan). Response: Map 3a deleted and Map 3 amended to show Leigh Sinton boundary in relation to SG.</p> <p>It is suggested that Map 3 (Significant Gap) be repositioned in the NDP so that it more closely relates to Policy LB/H/4 (rather than being included under Policy LB/H/5 – Site Allocation). Response: Map 3 repositioned</p> <p>Paragraph 5.1.8 – It is suggested that references to SWDP 2C and SWDP 2F are deleted because these do not relate to Significant Gaps and are not relevant to Policy LB/H/4. Reference to SWDP 2 D is appropriate. It is strongly recommended that greater reference is made to paragraph 8 of the Reasoned Justification for SWDP 2D which would help justify the types of development identified as being potentially acceptable in the Significant Gap. Response: Text amended as suggested.</p>
<p>Policy LB/H/5 – Site Allocation</p> <p>a. This Neighbourhood Plan allocates the following site for development to meet the indicative housing requirement to 2041. The site is indicated on Map 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site CFS0009, Land off the A4103, Leigh Sinton • Site area: 2.87Ha for residential use for approximately 52 dwellings • Approximately 2.82Ha potentially for sports and recreation use. <p>b. In addition to SWDP requirements for Affordable Housing the housing mix shall be informed by available Housing Needs Surveys and community consultation.</p> <p>c. The development shall be in accordance with other relevant policies of</p>	<p>Policy LB/H/5 has 2 parts.</p> <p>Part (a) proposes the allocation of a 5.69 hectare site on land off A4103 Leigh Sinton (shown on Map 2) for approximately 52 dwellings and 2.82 hectares for sports and recreation use.</p> <p>Part (b) suggests that the housing mix on the land off A4103 Leigh Sinton should be informed by (i) SWDP requirements for affordable housing, (iii) available Housing Needs Surveys and (iii) community consultation.</p> <p>It is considered that the principle of the proposed site allocation and requirement for a mix of housing is acceptable, but that the policy wording currently lacks sufficient clarity that it could be applied consistently and with confidence by decision makers.</p> <p>It is not clear from the wording in Part (a), the reasoned justification or Map 2 which parts of the proposed site allocation are proposed for housing</p>

the Leigh and Bransford Neighbourhood Plan and the South Worcestershire Development Plan.

and which parts for sports and recreation. **Response:** Map included with indicative layout.

Part (b) of the policy currently lacks clarity about the mix of types, sizes and tenures of housing that might be appropriate on the proposed site. Part (b) suggests that the mix be informed by 3 sources – the SWDP, housing needs surveys and community consultation. It is noted that the paragraph 5.1.21 refers to a Housing Needs Survey (HNS) carried out in May 2021 and it is understood that the Parish Council are awaiting the findings of the HNS. It is recommended that the Reasoned Justification summarise the key findings of the HNS and that the housing mix on the proposed allocation be informed by the HNS. **Response:** Summary of HNS included

Depending on the findings of the HNS, the Parish Council may wish to note that First Homes is a new national affordable home ownership programme which will offer first time home buyers at least a 30% discount on a new-build home. MHCLG's most recent "Notes on Neighbourhood Planning" newsletter (Spring 2021, Edition 26) says neighbourhood planning groups could apply a higher minimum discount of either 40% or 50% to First Homes, **where the evidence justifies this**. Neighbourhood planning groups will also be able to apply additional criteria to set a lower income cap, prioritise key workers, or specify a local connection requirement based on current work or residency, where evidence justifies this. **Response:** Noted

In relation to the Reasoned Justification, our comments include: **Response:** Each of the following eight bullet points amended as suggested.

- A number of references are made to the "allocated site". It should be noted that at this stage in the preparation of the NDP the site has not been allocated. At this stage it is a "proposed allocation".
- Paragraph 5.1.11, sentence 6 – It is suggested that the sentence be

	<p>amended to read “...an increase of more than 20%.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 5.1.11, sentence 8 makes reference to meeting the indicative housing requirement. It is suggested that it would be more logical to explain what the indicative housing requirement is before reference to meeting the requirement. • Paragraph 5.1.12. Before seeking to justify a requirement for affordable housing it is suggested that it would be more logical to justify the proposed allocation of site CFS 0009. Also, in relation to the proposed site allocation for 52 dwellings, it would be more relevant to include reference to SWDP 15Bi which, subject to viability considerations, requires 40% of units on sites of 15+dwellings to be provided. • Paragraph 5.1.14, Sentence 3 is not accurate and does not explain the intention and rationale of the proposed allocation and should therefore be deleted. The penultimate sentence is not wholly accurate. For accuracy it is suggested that the final part of the sentence which says “with a small addition to the original 2030 target” be deleted. For accuracy it is suggested that the sentence be amended to say “This may involve a potential allocation in the Neighbourhood Area.” • Paragraph 5.1.15. For accuracy, 1st sentence, replace “Clause” with “Paragraph”. 2nd sentence, replace “declared” with “proposed”. 6th sentence, replace “does” with “would”, replace “planning” with “plan-led approach”. 7th sentence, replace “decided” with “considered”. • Paragraph 5.1.16. For accuracy, 3rd sentence replace “to ask” with
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

“inviting” and “make available” with “be considered”

- Paragraph 5.1.17. For accuracy, 1st sentence replace “proposal to adopt” with “proposed site allocation on”. 4th sentence, replace “determined” with “considered”. 5th sentence replace “allocates” with “proposes to allocate”.
- Paragraph 5.1.17 – To keep the NDP precise and only include information relevant to the proposed site allocation it is suggested that the information in Appendix H could be included in a separate Background Report rather than included within the main body of the NDP. **Response: Amended as suggested**
- Paragraph 5.1.18 says the community had not shown a preference for community facilities. It is not clear that this is helpful in explaining the rationale for Policy LB/H/5. The penultimate sentence refers to approx. 5 hectares of land for sports and recreational facilities. The is not consistent with Policy LB/H/5 which refers to 2.82 ha for sports and recreation use. The final sentence, which refers to further consultation on the provision of community amenities, does not provide sufficient clarity to enable a decision maker to apply the policy consistently and with confidence. **Response: Areas of housing/ amenity amended. This text is in support of the choice of proposed site for allocation. The choice of amenities using S106 funds will be community led.**
- Paragraph 5.1.19 indicates that the age structure of the parish population in 2011 should inform the housing mix for the proposed allocation. It is considered that this would neither be robust evidence or provide sufficient clarity for decision makers to apply the policy consistently and with confidence. As outlined above, it is strongly suggested that the Reasoned Justification summarises the key findings of the 2021 HNS and that the housing mix on the

	<p>proposed allocation be informed by the HN.S Response: Text amended and summary of HNS included as Appendix 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 5.1.20. 2nd and 5th sentences, replace “allocated” with “proposed”. Generally, it is considered that paragraphs 4 – 7 are vague and do not clearly explain the rationale for Policy LB/H/5. Response: Amended • Paragraph 5.1.21. 1st and 2nd sentences – amend to NPPF (2021) and Paragraph 66. Paragraph 5.1.21 provides a context for paragraph 5.1.15. Logically therefore, it would make more sense for 5.1.21 to precede 5.1.15. Response: Text reordered • Paragraph 5.1.22 does not explain the intention and rationale of Policy LB/H/5. Response: Deleted
<p>5.2. Design</p>	
<p>Policy LB/D/1 - Maintaining Local Character</p> <p>a. Proposals for new developments should provide evidence to show how they will enhance and reinforce the local distinctiveness of an area. The general scale, mass, and layout of the site, building, or extension should respond to and integrate with local surroundings. Proposals should ensure that building height scale and form, including the roofline, does not obstruct the visual amenities of the streetscene and adversely impact on any significant wider views. Materials should be chosen to complement the development and add character to the surrounding environment. For any proposed development evidence must be provided to show how the existing conditions and the locally distinctive character of the area have been assessed and translated into proposals.</p> <p>b. Innovative designs, including visual impact and approach to energy</p>	<p>Policy LB/D/1 has 2 parts.</p> <p>Part (a) of Policy LB/D/1 says applicants <u>should</u> provide evidence to demonstrate that their development proposal will “enhance and reinforce” local distinctiveness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general scale, mass, and layout of the site, building, or extension should respond to and integrate with local surroundings. • The building height, scale and form should not obstruct the visual amenities of the street scene and adversely impact on any significant wider views. • Materials should complement the development and add character to the surrounding environment. • Evidence <u>must</u> be provided to show how the existing conditions and the locally distinctive character of the area have been assessed and translated into proposals.

efficiency and sustainability, will be considered favourably where they make a positive contribution to the character of the area and contribute to local distinctiveness.

Part (b) supports innovative designs (including visual impact and approach to energy efficiency and sustainability) where they make a positive contribution to the character of the area and contribute to local distinctiveness.

The Government is seeking to support high quality design in all new development. Paragraph 126 of the Framework says good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this.

Paragraph 127 of the Framework says plans should, at the most appropriate level, set out a clear design vision and expectations, so that applicants have as much certainty as possible about what is likely to be acceptable. Design policies should be developed with local communities so they reflect local aspirations, and are grounded in an understanding and evaluation of each area's defining characteristics. Neighbourhood plans can play an important role in identifying the special qualities of each area and explaining how this should be reflected in development.

Paragraph 128 of the Framework says that to provide maximum clarity about design expectations at an early stage, plans or supplementary planning documents should use visual tools such as design guides and codes. These provide a framework for creating distinctive places, with a consistent and high quality standard of design. However their level of detail and degree of prescription should be tailored to the circumstances in each place, and should allow a suitable degree of variety.

Paragraph 129 of the Framework says design guides and codes can be prepared at an area-wide, neighbourhood or site-specific scale, and to

carry weight in decision-making should be produced either as part of a plan or as supplementary planning documents. All guides and codes should take into account the guidance contained in the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code. These national documents should be used to guide decisions on applications in the absence of locally produced design guides or design codes.

Paragraph 134b of the Framework says that in determining applications, great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.

SWDP 21 (Design) seeks to ensure that new development will be of a high quality and integrates effectively with its surroundings and reinforces local distinctiveness. SWDP 21 is supported by the South Worcestershire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document which was adopted in 2018.

The principle of Policy LB/D/1 appears to have regard to the Framework and to be in general conformity with SWDP 21. However, it is considered that the generic nature of Policy LB/D/1 and the lack of information on the defining characteristics in Leigh & Bransford would make the policy difficult for decision makers to apply the policy consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications.

Specific concerns, together with suggestions about how part (a) of Policy LB/D/1 could be strengthened, include:

- It is suggested that it is made clearer what information applicants need to provide to demonstrate that the defining characteristics of the area have been reflected in the development proposal. Should the information be provided in a Design and Access Statement?

Response: The Neighbourhood Area is a diverse mixture of small dispersed settlements, isolated properties, and isolated small groups of properties; Leigh Sinton is the only significant nucleated settlement. The settlements have evolved slowly over many years resulting in buildings of many styles and ages. It is not possible to define the characteristics of the area in a design guide. This is why it is necessary to have an evaluation of each application.

- It would be helpful if the defining characteristics of the Neighbourhood Area were outlined, either within the Reasoned Justification or a separate Design Guide. **Response:** General text added
- It is considered that the requirement that “proposals should ensure that building height scale and form, including the roofline, does not obstruct the visual amenities of the street scene and adversely impact on any significant wider views” lacks sufficient clarity for a decision maker to apply it consistently and with confidence. It is unclear what is meant by obstructing the visual amenities of the street scene and it is unclear what significant views the policy is seeking to protect. **Response:** This sentence has been deleted from the policy.
- Does this mean affect the appearance of the street scene? Does it mean obstructing views from particular streets? What are these significant wider views? How are these to be judged? And where are the views from? Is this a thinly veiled attempt to prevent more development on the outer edges of the village that might interfere with views from existing houses? **Response:** the text has been deleted. Nevertheless we are confused by the final sentence of this comment as the LBNP proposes a site allocation on the outer edge

of Leigh Sinton.

- There needs to be consistency relating to whether applicants “should” or “must” provide evidence to demonstrate how their proposals would reflect local distinctiveness. Currently there is an inconsistency between sentences 1 and 5 of the policy. **Response:** Text amended to “ must” in this policy.
- It is considered that planning policy can seek to retain and enhance the defining characteristics of the area, but “reinforcing” the defining characteristics could stifle innovation and could be contrary to paragraph 134b of the Framework. **Response:** “reinforcing” amended to “retain”

It is considered that part (b) of Policy LB/D/1 has regard to paragraph 134b of the Framework.

It is considered that the Reasoned Justification for Policy LB/D/1 needs to be strengthened, including:

Response: Text amended in relation to following three bullet points

- Reference to Chapter 12 of the Framework (Achieving well-designed places)
- Information on the defining characteristics of the area.
- Ensure that the supporting text is relevant to the proposed policy. For example, currently the supporting text suggests that town houses and high density housing (without defining what would constitute high density in the context of Leigh and Bransford) would be inappropriate, but Policy LB/D/1 does not address density or housing types. Reference is also made in the supporting

	<p>text to gardens of a minimum 10.5m size (without providing a source for the evidence) but this is not specifically addressed in the policy. Response: Text amended</p>
<p>Policy LB/D/2 - Parking</p> <p>All developments will provide adequate in-curtilage parking spaces. Parking provision will comply with Worcestershire County Council’s Streetscape Design Guide (Spring 2020)(9)</p> <p>In addition:</p> <p>a) For developments greater than five dwellings visitor parking should be provided at one space for every five bedrooms.</p> <p>b) Where larger dwellings are divided, or extended, for flats or institutional use consideration should be given to the provision of adequate parking. Resident and staff parking should not result in additional on-street parking. A secure, waterproof cycle store should be provided for each unit.</p>	<p>Policy LB/D/2 proposes that car parking provision be in accordance with Worcestershire County Council’s Streetscape Design Guide. Additionally, developments of 6 or more dwellings to provide one space for every 5 bedrooms for visitors.</p> <p>Where “larger” (size unspecified) dwellings are divided or extended for flats or institutional use then residential or staff parking should not result in additional on-street parking. Additionally, a cycle store is to be provided for each unit. Response: “Larger” deleted.</p> <p>To provide clarity for both decision makers and applicants it is suggested that the car parking requirements in WCC’s Streetscape Design Guide are summarised in the Reasoned Justification. It is also suggested that the Reasoned Justification includes a weblink to the Streetscape Design Guide. Response: It is difficult to summarise the requirements. In the SGD the Tables indicating spaces/ dwelling are integral within the text and can be misleading in isolation. Weblink included</p> <p>Policy LB/D/2 refers to “all developments”. It would be helpful if the Reasoned Justification clarified whether the policy relates to all development or just residential development because criteria (a) and (b) seem to relate specially to residential development. Response: Text amended to residential</p> <p>In relation to criteria (a), the Reasoned Justification does not explain why the car parking requirements in WCC Streetscape Guide are not wholly adequate in Leigh & Bransford and why developments of 6 or more dwellings should provide additional car parking for visitors. Response: The</p>

	<p>provision for visitor parking is included in the WCC Streetscape Guide. The text explains the issues of parking in rural areas, particularly the lack of off-site on-street parking</p> <p>It is considered that criteria (b) duplicates Policy LB/H/3b which says that the subdivision of existing residential properties should not result in additional on-road car parking. Response: LB/H/3 amended with cross reference to LB/D/2</p> <p>In relation to criteria (b) it is not clear what the justification would be for a cycle store for each unit. For example, would it be appropriate to provide a cycle store for each unit in a residential care home? Response: Policy amended to exclude care homes</p> <p>It is considered that paragraphs 5.2.4 – 5.2.6 of the Reasoned Justification are not relevant to Policy LB/D/2 and should be deleted. These paragraphs relate to traffic volumes, speeding, lack of public transport and the proportion of households with no cars or 2 or more cars, but do not provide a rationale for the car parking requirements proposed in Policy LB/D/2. Response: Some text removed. Para 5.2.3 re-written. Degree of car ownership and lack of public transport add to parking problems on developments.</p>
<p>Policy LB/D/3 - Construction Waste and Recycling</p> <p>Excluding extensions and single dwellings evidence should be provided to show that consideration has been given to the re-use of waste arising from the construction process. In particular consideration should be given to topsoils and subsoils arising from the development process on site, for such purposes as landscaping, levelling of sites, the construction of bunds,</p>	<p>Policy LB/D/3 proposes that all development proposals (except extensions and single dwellings) provide evidence that consideration has been given to re-using waste arising from construction. The evidence would be assessed against relevant advice from the Environment Agency and policies in the Waste Core Strategy.</p> <p>It is considered that the principle of Policy LB/D/3 promotes good practice.</p>

<p>embankments or features for noise attenuation. Such proposals will be considered against relevant Environment Agency advice and policies in the Waste Core Strategy.</p>	<p>However, it is not clear whether the policy could be applied consistently and with confidence by decision makers, particularly as it is unclear what the relevant advice is from the Environment Agency is or what are the relevant policies in the Waste Core Strategy.</p> <p>To provide a better understanding of the proposed policy requirement(s) it is suggested that the Reasoned Justification summarises the relevant advice from the Environment Agency and clarifies the relevant policies in the Waste Core Strategy.</p> <p>It is suggested that an alternative wording for Policy LB/D/3 could be along the lines of “The re-use of waste arising from construction on-site is encouraged in accordance with Policy X of the Waste Core Strategy.”</p> <p>Response: Policy LB/D/3 has been reworded. : “Evidence should be provided to show that consideration has been given to the re-use of waste arising from the construction process”. This policy and the Evidence and Justification have been agreed with WCC as Waste Authority.</p>
<p>Policy LB/D/4 - Household Waste and Recycling</p> <p>Design of all buildings and dwellings from which refuse is collected should include consideration for adequate storage for waste and recycling, particularly to minimise visual impact.</p>	<p>Policy LB/D/4 proposes that all development should include consideration of adequate waste storage and recycling facilities.</p> <p>It is considered that the principle of Policy LB/D/4 is in general conformity with SWDP 33 (Waste).</p> <p>However, the wording of Policy LB/D/4 refers to all buildings and dwellings, but the title of the Policy relates specifically to household / residential development. Clarification is required as to whether Policy LB/D/4 relates to all development or just residential development. It is suggested that it</p>

	<p>should be the former.</p> <p>The wording of Policy LB/D/4 suggests that the provision of adequate waste storage and recycling facilities is “considered”. It is suggested that integrated or well screened bin storage or recycling facilities should be provided in residential development and that provision for waste storage avoiding where practicable open storage of commercial or industrial waste should be provided in non-residential development.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.2.8 says that each property will have 2 wheelie-bins. It is suggested that this be amended to say that MHDC currently provide residential properties with 2 wheelie-bins to make it clearer that this is not a future land-use requirement of Policy LB/D/4. Response:After consultation with MHDC and WCC policy has been reworded: In addition to the requirements of the Waste Core Strategy integrated or well screened bin storage or recycling facilities should be provided in residential development to minimise visual impact”. This policy and the Evidence and Justification have been agreed with WCC as Waste Authority.</p>
<p>Policy LB/D/5 - Site Operations</p> <p>Developments can be disruptive to the local community, often for some significant time. Proposals should demonstrate how deliveries and parking for operatives and tradespeople will be managed to minimise disruption.</p>	<p>Policy LB/D/5 says that all development proposals should demonstrate how the delivery and parking of tradespeople will be managed during the construction of development.</p> <p>Whilst it is recognised that the construction of development can be disruptive, it is temporary. Further Planning Practice Guidance says NDP’s should contain policies for the development and use of land. Also, paragraph 56 of the Framework says that “planning conditions should be kept to a minimum and only imposed where they are necessary, relevant</p>

	<p>to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.”</p> <p>It is considered that Policy LB/D/5 does not relate to the design of development.</p> <p>In light of the above it is considered that Policy LB/D/5 should be deleted. Response: Policy deleted.</p>
<p>Policy LB/D/6 - Dark Skies</p> <p>Where external lighting is proposed in a development it must be demonstrated that it is essential for the maintenance of health and safety by road users and building occupiers. Where street lighting is required it should be designed to reduce light pollution, interference with nocturnal species, and to protect the “dark sky”.</p> <p>.</p>	<p>Policy LB/D/6 requires proposals for external lighting to demonstrate that it is essential for the maintenance of health and safety by road users and building occupiers.</p> <p>Also, that any street lighting be designed to reduce light pollution, interference with nocturnal species and protect the “dark sky”.</p> <p>Paragraph 185c of the Framework says that planning policies should limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.</p> <p>However, paragraph 56 of the Framework also says that planning conditions should be kept to a minimum and only imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.</p> <p>It is considered that the first part of Policy LB/D/6 has regard to the Framework. It is not clear precisely how street lighting can be designed to reduce light pollution. It is considered that it may be appropriate to replace the second sentence of Policy LB/D/6 with wording along the following lines – “External lighting should avoid undue adverse impacts on amenity, wildlife and dark skies.” Response: Amended as suggested</p>
<p>5.3 Heritage, Landscape and Biodiversity</p>	

<p>Landscape</p>	
<p>Policy LB/HLB/1 - Landscape</p> <p>Where appropriate, new development should take into account the latest Worcestershire Landscape Character Assessment and its guidelines in accordance with SWDP 25 or successor policies. Developments should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Maintain and enhance hedgerows b. Conserve ancient woodland sites and plant new woodlands with locally occurring native species c. Conserve and restore tree cover along ditches, streams, and rivers. d. Make a positive contribution to the character of the surroundings and wider landscape. 	<p>Policy LB/HLB/1 has 2 parts.</p> <p>The first part of Policy LB/HLB/1 proposes that “where appropriate” new development should take into account the latest Worcestershire Landscape Character Assessment and its guidelines in accordance with SWDP 25.</p> <p>The second part of Policy LB/HLB/1 proposes that developments should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Maintain and enhance hedgerows b. Conserve ancient woodland sites and plant new woodlands with locally occurring native species c. Conserve and restore tree cover along ditches, streams, and rivers. d. Make a positive contribution to the character of the surroundings and wider landscape. <p>Paragraph 170 of the Framework says that planning policies should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes.</p> <p>However, Policy LB/HLB/1 does not indicate when or “where” it would be appropriate to apply the policy. The Policy therefore lacks sufficient clarity that a decision maker could apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications.</p> <p>Further, there are likely to be development proposals where it is not possible, or would not be appropriate, to meet the requirements in the second part of the policy.</p>

To provide a clearer policy which could be applied consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications it is suggested that a re-worded Landscape Character policy along the following lines may be more appropriate:

“Development proposals must demonstrate that:

- a. the characteristics and guidelines for the Landscape Type of the proposed site, as defined in the latest Landscape Character Assessment, have positively influenced the siting, design, scale, layout, landscaping and boundary treatment of the proposal; and*
- b. every available opportunity has been taken to strengthen the landscape character of the relevant Landscape Type, by retaining and conserving existing features such as trees, woodland and hedgerows, and by restoring, enhancing and making new provision where this is appropriate.”*

Response: Amended as suggested

In relation to the Reasoned Justification, comments include:

Paragraph 5.3.4 – the relevance of public footpaths to Policy LB/HLB/1 is not clear. **Response:** Deleted

Paragraph 5.3.5 says that the Neighbourhood Area is wholly within the “Principal Timbered Farmlands” landscape type. This is not correct according to Map 6 which shows that parts of the Neighbourhood Area are within the “Riverside Meadows” landscape type. **Response:** Text amended

	<p>It is considered that Map 6 showing the landscape types should be included as part of the Reasoned Justification for Policy LB/HLB/1 (rather than under the supporting text for LB/HLB/1). Response: Amended as suggested</p> <p>Paragraph 5.3.5, final paragraph (not numbered) includes reference to Natural England’s National Character Area and Map 5. Natural England’s National Character Area and Map 5 do not appear to have any direct relevance to Policy LB/HLB/1. Response: Deleted</p> <p>Paragraph 5.3.6 – Whilst it is clear that the local community value the local landscape, the relevance to “better management” of the landscape character, grass cutting and use of wild flowers do not seem to be directly related to Policy LB/HLB/1. Response: Amended as suggested</p>
<p>Policy LB/ HLB/2 - Local Green Spaces</p> <p>The following areas of land shown on Figures 1 and 2 are proposed as Local Green Space:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land adjacent to Brockamin Lane, Bransford • The orchard adjacent to Kiln Lane <p>Development that would result in the loss or partial loss of the Local Green Spaces will not be supported unless very special circumstances arise which outweigh the need for protection.</p>	<p>Policy LB/ HLB/4 proposes the designation of 2 Local Green Spaces:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meadow land adjacent to Brockamin Lane, Bransford 2. Orchard adjacent to Kiln Lane <p>The Framework makes provision for a Neighbourhood Plan to identify Local Green Spaces of particular importance to the local community. Paragraph 101 in the Framework says the designation of land as Local Green Space through Neighbourhood Plans allows communities to identify and protect green areas of particular importance to them.</p> <p>Local Green Space is a restrictive and significant policy designation. It gives the land a similar status to that of Green Belt and for that reason paragraph 102 of the Framework says that such designations should only be used when the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the</p>

community it serves, where it is demonstrably special to the local community and holds a particular local significance, is local in character and not an extensive tract of land.

Paragraph 5.3.7, paragraphs 6 and 7 (unnumbered) make clear that both proposed Local Green Spaces are in close proximity to the community they serve and are not extensive tracts of land. The Reasoned Justification explains that the proposed Local Green Space adjacent to Brockamin Lane is demonstrably special to the local community because it is widely used by local walkers and dog walkers and the orchard, adjacent to Kiln Lane, “has been widely used for many years by local residents who value the traditional orchard and the wildlife it sustains.” It is considered that the justification for the orchard should be checked because “widely used by residents” and the “wildlife it sustains” do not immediately appear to be complimentary. **Response: Amended.**

Paragraph 5.3.7 – It is suggested that “mechanism” is replaced with “opportunity”. It is suggested that references to “Green Space” are replaced by “Local Green Space” to differentiate the proposed sites from other designated Green Spaces in the development plan.

Response: Amended as suggested

Paragraph 5.3.7 – Given that both proposed Local Green Spaces are “widely used” by local residents, it is not clear why the Reasoned Justification highlights that Local Green Space designation does not grant public access. Paragraph 5.3.7, paragraph 8 (unnumbered) then says that “the landowner **currently** permits public access to the orchard.” This provides a mixed message about whether the orchard is / will be widely used by residents that it would be helpful to resolve. It should be noted

	<p>that paragraph 101 of the Framework says that “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.” Response: Amended as suggested</p>
<p>Policy LB/ HLB/3 - Key Views</p> <p>To be supported development proposals must demonstrate that they are sited, designed and of such a scale that they do not substantially harm the key views (identified on Fig 3) when seen from locations that are freely accessible to members of the general public.</p>	<p>Policy LB/HLB/3 identifies 3 key views which are listed in para 5.3.8, paragraphs 2 – 4 (unnumbered) and identified in Figure 3.</p> <p>Paragraph 174 of the Framework says that the planning system should protect and enhance valued landscapes.</p> <p>Whilst national and local planning policy protects local character, it does not provide or protect a “right to a view.” Planning policies can seek to protect specific views where this is justified in the wider public interest (for example from a public footpath, right of way, roadside, or other publicly accessible land).</p> <p>Figure 3 identifies the general location and direction of the proposed Key Views. To provide a practical framework for decision makers (and applicants) it would be helpful if the scale of the map was reduced so that the precise location of the key views was clearer. It is noted, for example, that the description of View 1 says that the view is from the A4103, but Figure 3 suggests that the view is south of Leigh Sinton. Response: Map will be amended to make clearer. The view is from Stocks Lane, not a single point.</p> <p>It is important that objective criteria are established for the identification and grading of views and it is noted that the proposed views have been assessed against criteria listed in Appendix E of the NDP. If the 3 key views have been assessed against the criteria in Appendix E, it is suggested that the word “Potential” be removed from the title in Appendix E. Response:</p>

	<p style="text-align: center;">Amended as suggested</p> <p>It is considered that the Policy wording of Policy LB/ HLB/3 would have regard to the Framework.</p>
<p>Heritage</p>	
<p>Policy LB/ HLB/4 - Heritage</p> <p>To be supported, proposals which affect a non-designated heritage asset (a building or structure on the Local List (following adoption by Malvern Hills District Council) must demonstrate how they protect or enhance the heritage asset.</p> <p>To be supported, proposals for the renovation or alteration of a non-designated heritage asset (building or structure) must be designed sensitively, and with careful regard to the heritage asset’s historical and architectural interest and setting.</p>	<p>Policy LB/ HLB/4 seeks to protect, and where possible, enhance, non-designated heritage assets on the Local List (following adoption by Malvern Hills District Council).</p> <p>Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and paragraph 189 of the Framework requires that historic assets should be conserved in a manner that is appropriate to their significance.</p> <p>Policy LB/ HLB/4 helpfully distinguishes between designated heritage assets (such as listed buildings and conservation areas) and other heritage assets (identified by the local authority).</p> <p>Paragraph 5.3.9 of the Reasoned Justification makes it clear that the Local List will be designated and maintained by Malvern Hills District Council.</p> <p>Whilst some Parish and Town Councils have sought to nominate non-designated heritage assets for consideration in the MHDC Local List SPD through the NDP process, it is noted that Leigh & Bransford Parish Council’s preferred approach is to propose potential assets outside the NDP process. This is an acceptable approach. It is suggested that sentences 5 and 7 of paragraph 5.3.9 should be replaced by a new paragraph which says that a proposed task for Parish Council (see Appendix B) will be to identify potential non-designated heritage assets for consideration in the MHDC Local List SPD. It is suggested that Task 2 in Appendix B should differentiate between this action and liaison about maintaining the</p>

	<p>historic and rural landscape. Response: Amended as suggested</p> <p>It is considered that the wording of Policy LB/HLB/4 has regard to the Framework.</p>
<p>Policy LB/ HLB/5 - Archaeology</p> <p>a. Development proposals should avoid or minimise any conflict with known surface and sub- surface archaeology included in the Worcestershire Historic Environment Record.</p> <p>b. Proposals should also ensure unknown and potentially significant deposits are identified and appropriately considered during development. Lack of current evidence of sub-surface archaeology must not be taken as proof of absence.</p> <p>c. Where proposals are likely to affect heritage assets with archaeological interest, they should be accompanied by a description informed by available evidence, desk-based assessment and, where appropriate, field evaluation to establish the significance of known or potential heritage assets.</p>	<p>Policy LB/ HLB/5 requires all development proposals to avoid or minimise conflict with known surface and subsurface archaeology that are included in the Worcestershire Historic Environment Record (HER).</p> <p>Policy LB/ HLB/5 proposes that a lack of current evidence of surface or sub-surface archaeology must not be taken as proof of absence.</p> <p>Where proposals are likely to affect heritage assets with archaeological interest, they should be accompanied by a description informed by available evidence, desk-based assessment and, where appropriate, field evaluation to establish the significance of known or potential heritage assets.</p> <p>Paragraph 194 of the Framework says that where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.</p> <p>SWDP 24 (Management of the Historic Environment) says that where proposals are likely to affect heritage assets with archaeological interest they should be accompanied by a description informed by available evidence, desk-based assessment and, where appropriate, field evaluation to establish the significance of known or potential heritage assets.</p> <p>It is considered that the wording of Policy LB/ HLB/5 has regard to the Framework and is in general conformity with SWDP 24.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.3.12 says that the Parish Council commissioned</p>

	<p>Worcestershire Historic Environment Record (HER) searches for the Neighbourhood Area and that a summary of the searches is provided in Appendix C. In order to provide greater certainty for applicants and to enable decision makers to apply Policy LB/ HLB/5 consistently and with greater confidence it would be helpful if these sites of archaeological interest were listed in the Reasoned Justification or an Appendix and their location was shown on a map in the NDP. Response: Map now included</p>
<p>Policy LB/ HLB/6 - Farmsteads and Agricultural Buildings</p> <p>Redevelopment, alteration or extension of historic farmsteads and agricultural buildings within the Neighbourhood Area (as shown on Map 9) should be sensitive to their local distinctiveness and character, materials and form and take into account their contribution to the character of the landscape.</p> <p>Due reference and consideration should be made to the Worcestershire Farmstead Assessment Framework.</p>	<p>Policy LB/ HLB/6 says that proposals for the redevelopment, alteration or extension of historic farmsteads should be sensitive to their local distinctiveness and character, materials and form, and take into account their contribution to the character of the landscape.</p> <p>Due reference and consideration should be made to the Worcestershire Farmstead Assessment Framework.</p> <p>Farmsteads, and in particular traditional farm buildings of 19th century or earlier date make an important contribution to local distinctiveness and a sense of place, through their varied forms, use of materials and the way they relate to the surrounding landscape and settlement.</p> <p>SWDP 6 (Historic Environment) supports development proposals where they conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets, including historic farmsteads.</p> <p>It is considered that the principle of Policy LB/ HLB/6 is in general conformity with SWDP 6.</p> <p>However, it is suggested that the first sentence of Policy LB/ HLB/6 be amended to say <i>“Redevelopment, alteration or extension of historic farmsteads and agricultural buildings within the Neighbourhood Area (as shown on Map 9) should be sensitive to</i></p>

	<p><i>their local distinctiveness and character, materials and form and take into account their contribution to the character of the landscape.” Whilst historic farmsteads may make a contribution to the landscape character and local distinctiveness, it is considered that it would be inappropriate to consider the merits of a proposal for redevelopment, alteration or extension on these wider factors.</i></p> <p>Response: Amended as suggested</p> <p>Map 9 helpfully shows the location of the historic farmsteads. It is suggested that Map 9 should be included the Reasoned Justification for Policy LB/ HLB/6, rather than under LB/HLB/7 (Conservation Areas). Response: Amended as suggested</p> <p>To provide clarity for decision makers and applicants it is also suggested that the historic farmsteads shown in Map 9 are listed either in the Reasoned Justification or in an Appendix. Response: They are listed in the HER and a weblink will be inserted.</p> <p>To provide clarity for decision makers and applicants it is also suggested that the Reasoned Justification include a weblink to the Worcestershire Farmstead Assessment Framework. Response: weblink to be inserted</p>
<p>Policy LB/HLB/7 - Conservation Areas</p> <p>d. Development proposals shall be guided by Conservation Area Appraisals in Conservation Areas. The Conservation Area at Leigh is indicated on Map 7.</p>	<p>Policy LB/HLB/7 says that development proposals in the Leigh Conservation Area should be guided by a Leigh Conservation Area Appraisal.</p> <p>Paragraph 189 of the Framework says that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.</p>

Paragraph 207 of the Framework says that not all elements of a Conservation Area will necessarily contribute to its significance. Loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area should be treated either as substantial harm under paragraph 200 or less than substantial harm under paragraph 201, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area as a whole.

A Leigh Conservation Area Appraisal was published in 1995. It should be noted that the Appraisal is now 26 years old and therefore is not considered to be up-to-date. Nevertheless, it is suggested that there may be elements of the Appraisal that remain relevant and these could potentially be drawn upon in the Reasoned Justification.

It is suggested that Policy LB/HLB/7 is either amended or a new policy is developed. If the Policy is amended, it is suggested that a policy along the following lines may be appropriate:

“Development proposals within the Leigh Conservation Area or its setting should preserve or enhance its character or appearance, having regard to its significance and special interest as set out in the Leigh Conservation Appraisal.”

If a new policy is developed, it is suggested that a policy along the following lines may be appropriate. It should be noted that any Conservation Area policy would need to be supported by proportionate evidence.

“Development proposals within Leigh Conservation Area or its setting should preserve or enhance its character or appearance, having regard to its significance and special interest.”

Proposals will be supported provided that they:

- a. serve to preserve or positively enhance the Conservation Area by virtue of their use, character and design; and*
- b. avoid any demolition of a building or structure if its loss would be harmful to the character of the Conservation Area; and*
- c. respect the prevailing density of buildings and their plan form, recognising the variations that occur in these factors within the Conservation Area; and*
- d. reflect the size, height, scale, form, proportions and detailing of the existing and surrounding built form; and*
- e. use local materials and vernacular techniques wherever possible; and*
- f. ensure that any extensions and service buildings are subsidiary to the main property, are not unduly prominent in the street scene, and use sympathetic materials to the main property; and*
- g. retain important views, open spaces, boundary features, trees and hedgerows; and*
- h. specify local materials or native species for any new boundary treatments such as walls, railings, fencing or hedging; and preserve the open countryside setting of the Conservation Area.”*

Response:
Amended as suggested

It is noted that the Reasoned Justification for Policy LB/HLB/7 includes Map 7 (Leigh Conservation Area), Map 8 (Buildings in Leigh & Bransford) and Map 9 (Traditional Farmsteads in Leigh & Bransford). It is suggested that Map 9 be moved to support Policy LB/HLB/6. It is unclear which policy Map 8 supports, so it is suggested that the map be deleted. **Response: Map 8 moved to**

Appendix D. Map 9 moved as suggested

<p>Biodiversity</p>	
<p>Policy LB/HLB/8 - Biodiversity</p> <p>Development proposals that impact on local wildlife and habitats, particularly those shown on Map 10 and Map 11, should demonstrate how biodiversity will be protected and enhanced.</p>	<p>Policy LB/HLB/8 proposes that all development proposals, and particularly those on unspecified sites shown on Maps 10 and 11, should demonstrate how biodiversity will be protected and enhanced.</p> <p>Paragraph 179 of the Framework says that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity; wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them; and areas identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation; and b) promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. <p>Policy LB/HLB/8 seeks to have regard to paragraph 179 but is not drafted with sufficient clarity that it could applied consistently and with confidence by decision makers, nor is it supported by robust evidence of about the wildlife habitats that it seeks to protect (see comments on LB/HLB/9 below).</p> <p>To meet the above requirements it is considered that Policy LB/HLB/8 would need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify whether the policy applies to all development proposals or just those shown on Maps 10 and 11.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly show the boundaries of the sites on Maps 10 and 11 that are to be protected / enhanced. • Include evidence outlining the significance of the wildlife habitats shown on Maps 10 and 11. • Indicate how development proposals on the identified sites should demonstrate that biodiversity will be protected and enhanced. <p>If Policy LB/HLB/8 is to be retained, it is recommended that Maps 10 and/or 11 be included in the supporting text for LB/HLB/8 (rather than LB/HLB/9). Response: some text amended and Maps moved to Evidence and Justification.</p>
<p>Policy LB/HLB/9 - Biodiversity Net Gain</p> <p>To be supported development proposals must demonstrate a net gain in biodiversity wherever practical and viable by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Retaining existing wildlife habitats and landscape features (such as watercourses, ponds, unimproved grassland, and orchards) to support biodiversity. b. Creating new wildlife habitats c. Including native flora in replacement planting, and new planting, such as hedgerow s, landscaping, and open spaces. d. Creating a biodiversity-friendly environment by including features such as bat boxes, bird boxes, nest cups, and bee bricks 	<p>Policy LB/HLB/9 proposes that all new development proposals should, wherever practical and viable, demonstrate a net gain in biodiversity by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Retaining existing wildlife habitats and landscape features (e.g. woodland, ancient and notable trees, watercourses, ponds, unimproved grassland and orchards); b) Creating new wildlife habitats; c) Including native flora in new (and replacement) planting such as hedgerows, landscaping and open spaces; d) Creating a biodiversity-friendly environment (by including features such as bat boxes, bird boxes, nest cups, and bee bricks); and e) Including wildlife friendly boundary treatments that facilitate the

<p>e. Including wildlife friendly boundary treatments that facilitate the movement of species.</p> <p>f. –</p> <p>g. Providing a statement of conformity from a competent and qualified person that any measures required have been properly carried out.</p> <p>See also Policy LB/IFD/1d</p>	<p>movement of species.</p> <p>f) (not g) provide a statement of conformity from a competent and qualified person that any measures required have been properly carried out.</p> <p>Paragraph 174d of the Framework says that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.</p> <p>Paragraph 179b of the Framework says plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity.</p> <p>SWDP 22 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity) addresses biodiversity at a more strategic level. SWDP22 says development which would compromise the favourable condition or the favourable conservation status of a Grassland Inventory Site (GIS), a Local Wildlife Site (LWS), a Local Geological Site (LGS), an important individual tree or woodland and species or habitats of principal importance recognised in the Biodiversity Action Plan, or listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, will only be permitted if the need for and the benefits of the proposed development outweigh the loss.</p> <p>It is considered that Policy LB/HLB/9 seeks to have regard to paragraph 174d and 179b of the Framework.</p> <p>However:</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>It is considered that criteria f/g be deleted. Criteria (a) to (e) indicate conditions that planning applications should demonstrate, subject to practicality and viability, to be supported. Criterion f/g could only be met after development has been approved and the development has been built out. Response: (f) deleted</p> <p>It is considered that paragraphs 5.3.16 – 5.3.17 are vague, do not relate specially to the Neighbourhood Area and do not directly support the choices made and the approach taken. Response: Noted</p> <p>Paragraphs 5.3.18 – 5.3.19 refer to an “Ecological Search for Leigh & Bransford Neighbourhood Area” undertaken by Worcestershire County Council. Whilst this background report is summarised in Appendix D, it is strongly recommended that relevant information from this report is summarised in the supporting text for Policies LB/HLB/8 and/or LB/HLB/9 to support the choices made and the approach taken. It is also strongly suggested that the supporting text includes a weblink to the background report. Response: weblink to be added</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<p>5.4 Green Infrastructure</p>	
<p>Policy LB/GI/1 – Green Infrastructure</p> <p>Where appropriate new development should ensure the protection and enhancement of the green infrastructure assets and the creation of multifunctional green infrastructure networks as part of a master planning, landscaping and building design. These networks should contribute to the ecological enhancements, flood risk and water quality management,</p>	<p>Policy LB/GI/1 proposes that “where appropriate” all new development should protect and enhance “green infrastructure assets” and create “multifunctional green infrastructure networks” as part of master planning, landscaping and building design.</p> <p>The “multifunctional green infrastructure networks” should contribute to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ecological enhancements, • flood risk and water quality management,

landscape and historic character of Leigh and Bransford. The proposal should demonstrate how these networks will be achieved, and subsequently maintained in the future.

- landscape and historic character of Leigh and Bransford

Development proposals should demonstrate how these “multifunctional green infrastructure networks” will be achieved and maintained in the future.

Green Infrastructure (GI) is defined in the Framework as a network of multi-functional green and blue spaces and other natural features, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental, economic, health and wellbeing benefits for nature, climate, local and wider communities and prosperity.

Paragraph 20 of the Framework says that **strategic policies** should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development, and make sufficient provision for, amongst other things, green infrastructure.

Paragraph 175 of the Framework says that plans should take a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure.

The relationship between Policy LB/GI/1 and the strategic SWDP 5 (Green Infrastructure) is unclear. SWDP 5A requires housing development proposals (including mixed-use schemes) to contribute towards the provision, maintenance, improvement and connectivity of GI as follows (subject to financial viability):

- i. For greenfield sites exceeding 1ha (gross) - 40% Green Infrastructure
- ii. For greenfield sites of less than 1ha but more than 0.2ha (gross) – 20% Green Infrastructure.

iii. For brownfield sites – no specific Green Infrastructure (GI) figure.

The strategic policy SWDP 5 B says the precise form and function(s) of GI will depend on local circumstances and the Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Strategy’s priorities. Developers should seek to agree these matters with the local planning authority in advance of a planning application. Effective management arrangements should also be clearly set out and secured. Once a planning permission has been implemented, the associated GI will be protected as Green Space.

The strategic policy SWDP 5C says that other than specific site allocations in the development plan, development proposals that would have a detrimental impact on important GI attributes within the areas identified as “protect and enhance” or “protect and restore”, as identified on the Environmental Character Areas Map , will not be permitted unless:

- i. A robust, independent assessment of community and technical need shows the specific GI typology to be surplus to requirements in that location; and
- ii. Replacement of, or investment in, GI of at least equal community and technical benefit is secured.

It is considered that Policy LB/GI/1 is not currently drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker could apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. For example:

- It is not clear what, or where, the green infrastructure assets are that the policy is seeking to protect and enhance.
- It is not clear when it would be appropriate to apply the policy. Would the policy apply to proposals for a single dwelling or would

	<p>a size threshold apply?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If development proposals were required to “contribute to ecological enhancements, flood risk and water quality management, landscape and historic character of Leigh and Bransford” would the policy be subject to a viability caveat? <p>Planning Practice Guidance says a Neighbourhood Plan policy “should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence. It should be distinct to reflect and respond to the unique characteristics and planning context of the specific neighbourhood area for which it has been prepared.” The supporting text refers to a Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Framework (2013) but does not include any evidence that relates specifically to the Leigh & Bransford Neighbourhood Area.</p> <p>In light of the above, it is considered that Policy LB/GI/1, as currently proposed, should be deleted. Response: Deleted. Landscape, Heritage, and Drainage policies cover many issues. Some text relevant to GI will be included in Landscape policy Evidence and Justification.</p>
5.5 Infrastructure and Energy	
Renewable and Low Carbon Energy	General Comments
<p>Policy LB/IRLCE/1 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (On-site)</p> <p>To increase the supply of renewable and low carbon energy and heat, all new developments over 100 m² gross or one or more dwellings should incorporate the generation of energy from renewable or low carbon sources equivalent to at least 20% of predicted energy requirements unless it has been demonstrated that this would make the development unviable.</p>	<p>Policy LB/IRLCE/1 has 2 parts.</p> <p>The first part of Policy LB/IRLCE/1 proposes that all new development over 100m² or one or more dwellings incorporate renewable or local energy technologies to meet at least 20% of the developments predicted energy requirements.</p>

Proposed developments should seek to provide a Home Quality Mark of 4*, and for commercial developments, a BREEAM assessment of Excellent.

The second part of Policy LB/IRLCE/1 proposes that development proposals for dwellings should seek to meet BRE Home Quality 4 star rating and commercial developments should be BREEAM excellent.

In relation to the first part of LB/IRLCE/1, paragraph 155 of the Framework says that to help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy and heat, plans should provide a positive strategy for energy from these sources, that maximises the potential for suitable development ...”

SWDP 27 (Renewable & Low Carbon Energy) requires all new development over 100m² or one or more dwellings incorporate renewable or local energy technologies to meet at least 10% of the developments predicted energy requirements, unless it can be demonstrated that this would make the development unviable.

Whilst SWDPR 31 (Renewable & Low Carbon Energy) in the SWDPR Preferred Options (November 2019) proposes a 20% renewable or low carbon energy requirement, it should be noted that this is an emerging draft policy that has not yet been tested at examination.

It should be noted that:

- a draft neighbourhood plan must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan in force if it is to meet the basic condition.
- the ability to impose reasonable requirements for a proportion of energy used in developments to be from renewable or low carbon sources is conferred to local planning authorities through the Planning and Energy Act (2008). This ability does not extend to Town or Parish Councils.
- an important element of SWDP 27 is that it includes a caveat in the event that the applicant can demonstrate that the requirement would make the proposal unviable (in accordance with paragraph

	<p>58 of the Framework). Policy LB/IRLCE/1 does not include this caveat. Response: It does</p> <p>In light of the above, it is considered that Policy LB/IRLCE/1, as currently worded, would not meet the Basic Conditions.</p> <p>In relation to the second part of Policy LB/IRLCE/1, comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no explanation or justification of what Home Quality 4 star rating or BREEAM excellent entails or how applicants should demonstrate that their developments will meet these requirements. This would make it difficult for decision makers to apply the policy consistently and with confidence. • It is understood that BRE Home Quality and BREEAM standards do not relate specifically to renewable energy. It is therefore unclear why they are included in a policy which specifically relates to the generation of renewable and low carbon energy. Response: Deleted • There is a lack of robust evidence justifying the policy requirement. • The requirement does not include a viability caveat. <p>It should also be noted that paragraph 154b of the Framework says that any local requirements for the sustainability of buildings should reflect the Government’s policy for national technical standards. It is not clear whether the requirements of the second part of Policy LB/IRLCE/1 would reflect the Government’s policy for national technical standards. Response: reference to BREEAM and BRE Home Quality deleted.</p>
<p>Policy LB/IRLCE/2 – (Stand Alone) Renewable and Low Carbon Energy</p> <p>In relation to SWDP 27 Proposals for stand-alone renewable or low carbon energy projects and associated infrastructure in or likely to affect the Leigh</p>	<p>Policy LB/IRLCE/2 supports stand-alone renewable or low carbon energy projects subject to 7 criteria being met:</p>

& Bransford Neighbourhood Area will be supported where they can demonstrate that the following requirements can be met. In making this assessment, any other existing, permitted or proposed similar developments in the locality will be taken into account so that cumulative impacts are considered. Wherever possible, proposals should be situated on previously-developed or non- agricultural land which is not of high environmental value. The requirements are that:

- a. any proposed use of agricultural land has been shown to be necessary, that poorer quality land has been used in preference to land of higher quality, and that the proposal allows for continued agricultural use where applicable and practicable, and encourages biodiversity improvements; and
- b. the impacts on landscape character, views and visual amenity are acceptable, or are capable of being satisfactorily mitigated by a landscaping scheme which is itself acceptable; and
- c. there will be no undue loss of amenity to the occupiers of residential properties, including by way of security fencing, noise, lighting or the design and siting of any installation; and
- d. the local highway network and the proposed means of vehicular access can cater safely for both the volume and type of vehicles anticipated, and the proposed access is environmentally acceptable; and
- e. where relevant, sustainable drainage proposals are included to acceptably manage surface water and avoid risk of pollution, soil erosion and damage to wildlife habitats; and
- f. there are no unacceptable impacts on the natural and historic environments, taking account of the impact on views important to the setting of heritage assets; and

- a. poorer quality agricultural land has been used in preference to land of higher quality, agricultural use can continue and biodiversity improvements are encouraged; and
- b. impacts on landscape character, views and visual amenity are acceptable, or are capable of being satisfactorily mitigated; and
- c. no undue loss of amenity to the occupiers of residential properties; and
- d. safe and environmentally acceptable access to the highway network; and
- e. flood risk and surface water management where relevant; and
- f. consideration of the natural and historic environment; and
- g. no unacceptable impacts on public rights of way.

The potential cumulative impacts of similar developments in the locality would be taken into account.

Also, where appropriate, planning conditions would be imposed to ensure that installations are removed when no longer in use and that land is restored to its previous use.

Paragraph 155 of the Framework says that to help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy and heat, plans should provide a positive strategy for energy from these sources, that maximises the potential for suitable development, while ensuring that adverse impacts are addressed satisfactorily (including cumulative landscape and visual impacts).

SWDP 27 C (Stand Alone Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Schemes) says with the exception of wind turbines proposals for stand-alone renewable and other low carbon energy schemes are welcomed and will be considered favourably having regard to the provisions of other relevant policies in the Plan.

It is generally considered that Policy LB/IRLCE/2 has regard to the Framework and is in general conformity with SWDP 27C.

<p>g. there are no unacceptable impacts on the utility and enjoyment of public rights of way.</p> <p>Where appropriate, planning conditions will be imposed to ensure that installations are removed when no longer in use and the land is restored to its previous use and condition.</p>	<p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently, the supporting text does not provide proportionate, robust evidence to support the approach taken. It is strongly recommended that a Reasoned Justification along the lines of a similar policy (Policy TOAD14) in the Ombersley and Doverdale Neighbourhood Plan be included. Response: Text added • Neighbourhood Plan policies can only relate to development proposals in the Neighbourhood Area – ie, they do not apply to proposals outside the Neighbourhood Area that might affect the Neighbourhood Area. • Paragraph 158, footnote 54 says “Except for applications for the repowering of existing wind turbines, a proposed wind energy development involving one or more turbines should not be considered acceptable unless it is in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in the development plan; and, following consultation, it can be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by the affected local community have been fully addressed and the proposal has their backing.” <p>In light of the above 2 bullet points, it is considered that the first line of Policy LB/IRLCE/2 should be amended along the following lines if it is to meet the Basic Conditions – “In relation to SWDP 27 With the exception of wind turbines, proposals for stand-alone renewable or low carbon energy projects and associated infrastructure in or likely to affect the Leigh & Bransford Neighbourhood Area will be supported where they can demonstrate that the following requirements can be met:” Response: Amended as suggested</p>
<p>Policy LB/IRLCE/3 - Electric Vehicle Charging</p>	<p>Policy LB/IRLCE/3 has 2 parts.</p> <p>The first part of Policy LB/IRLCE/3 requires new dwellings to include an</p>

Proposals for any new dwelling where parking is provided must have an appropriately located electric vehicle charging point. Where general parking areas are included in housing developments, these are required to provide one charging point. Proposals for new employment, leisure or retail developments are encouraged to provide electric charging points for staff and/or users.

electric vehicle charging point. Also, any “general parking area” in housing developments would be required to provide a single charging point.

The second part of Policy LB/IRLCE/3 encourages development proposals for new employment, leisure or retail developments to provide electric charging points.

The principle of Policy LB/IRLCE/3 seems to have regard to paragraph 112e of the Framework which says applications for development should be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations..

It may be of interest to note that Policy LB/IRLCE/3 is also generally consistent with emerging draft Policy SWDPR 3E.

However:

- In relation to the requirement for EV charging points in “general parking areas”, who would be responsible for installation / maintenance and paying for the electricity used? Also, would the provision of EV charging points in general parking areas be subject to any design guidance? **Response:** General parking areas removed from policy.
- It is not clear why EV charging points would be a requirement for housing development but only be encouraged in employment, leisure or retail uses. **Response:** EV charging now included for employment, leisure or retail uses.
- It is suggested that the Reasoned Justification should be strengthened and that reference to the Worcestershire County Council’s Streetscape Design Guide would be helpful. **Response:** Amended as suggested

<p>Infrastructure: Flooding and Drainage</p>	
<p>LB/IFD/1 - Flooding and Drainage</p> <p>All developments will be required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Adopt the general principals of the CIRIA Report C753, “The SuDS Manual”. b. As a minimum, demonstrate that for a greenfield site, the post-development surface water run-off rate will not increase and for brownfield sites show that post development run-off will result in a 30% reduction in surface water run-off compared with the pre-development situation. c. Undertake on-site investigation including definition of soil characteristics and site geology. d. Where any soakaway drainage/ infiltration solutions are proposed: If required, undertake permeability / porosity tests from guidance in BRE Digest 365 “Soakaway Design” by a suitably qualified professional and provide full test results. e. Take opportunities for drainage (ditches, swales, balancing ponds etc) to enhance biodiversity and biodiversity corridors f. Provide details of future maintenance requirements for solutions adopted 	<p>Policy LB/IFD/1 requires all development proposals to meet the following 6 criteria to mitigate flooding and drainage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Adopt the principals of the CIRIA Report C753, “The SuDS Manual”. b. Greenfield sites must demonstrate that post-development surface water run-off rate will not increase, whilst brownfield sites must demonstrate that post development run-off will result in a 30% reduction in surface water run-off. c. An on-site investigation must be undertaken which includes a definition of soil characteristics and site geology. d. Where soakaway drainage/ infiltration solutions are proposed, permeability / porosity tests by a suitably qualified professional should be provided. e. Opportunities should be taken for drainage (ditches, swales, balancing ponds etc) to enhance biodiversity and biodiversity corridors. f. Maintenance requirements for adopted flooding and drainage solutions should be provided. <p>Paragraph 159 of the Framework says inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.</p> <p>Paragraph 160 of the Framework says that strategic policies should be informed by a strategic flood risk assessment, and should manage flood risk from all sources. They should consider cumulative impacts in, or affecting, local areas susceptible to flooding, and take account of advice from the Environment Agency and other relevant flood risk management authorities, such as lead local flood authorities and internal drainage boards.</p>

Paragraph 161 of the Framework says All plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development – taking into account all sources of flood risk and the current and future impacts of climate change – so as to avoid, where possible, flood risk to people and property. They should do this, and manage any residual risk, by:

- a) applying the sequential test and then, if necessary, the exception test as set out below;
- b) safeguarding land from development that is required, or likely to be required, for current or future flood management;
- c) using opportunities provided by new development and improvements in green and other infrastructure to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding, (making as much use as possible of natural flood management techniques as part of an integrated approach to flood risk management); and
- d) where climate change is expected to increase flood risk so that some existing development may not be sustainable in the long-term, seeking opportunities to relocate development, including housing, to more sustainable locations.

Relevant strategic policies in the SWDP are SWDP28 (Management of Flood Risk) and SWDP 29 (Sustainable Drainage Systems).

The Reasoned Justification clearly indicates that there are flooding hotspots in the Neighbourhood Area and the intention of Policy LB/IFD/1 is clearly to ensure that flood risk is not increased as a result of development.

However:

Policy LB/IFD/1 does not appear to apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development as required by paragraph 161 of the Framework and SWDP 28. **Response: Policy LB/I/4 (formerly LB/IFD/1) is a site based approach. It is supplementary to the sequential approach does not seek to replace it. The sequential risk-based approach is included in SWDP 28 which has not been**

repeated. Policy LB/I/4 addresses local conditions subordinate to sequential test. Relevant strategic policies in the SWDP are SWDP28 (Management of Flood Risk) and SWDP 29 (Sustainable Drainage Systems). Policy LB/IFD/1 takes a site based approach ensuring that sites not identified at strategic level do not cause local flooding issues, and to ensure developments do cause or exacerbate flooding within the development site. The policy text was agreed by WCC Flood Risk Management Team, who commented that the policy and text was, "*Clear and comprehensive*".

Policy LB/IFD/1 seeks to apply to all development proposals. It should be noted that paragraph 168 of the Framework says that applications for some minor development and changes of use should not be subject to the sequential or exception tests but should still meet the requirements for site-specific flood risk assessments set out in footnote 54 (should be footnote 55). Footnote 55 says that in Flood Zone 1, an assessment should accompany all proposals involving: sites of 1 hectare or more; land which has been identified by the Environment Agency as having critical drainage problems; land identified in a strategic flood risk assessment as being at increased flood risk in future; or land that may be subject to other sources of flooding, where its development would introduce a more vulnerable use. **Response:** Flooding in the area is more likely to be pluvial caused by the persistent impermeable ground conditions than by the conditions identified by Flood Zones.

- The Reasoned Justification does not include sufficient evidence to support the very specific requirements proposed, particularly criteria (a) and (c).
- In relation to criterion (c) it should be noted that paragraph 56 of the Framework says that planning conditions should be kept to a minimum and only imposed where they are **necessary**, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and **reasonable** in all other respects.

	Response: Criterion (c) deleted
Infrastructure: Electronic Communications	
<p>Policy LB/IC/2 - Communications</p> <p>Any new development within the Neighbourhood Area should be served by full fibre broadband connections unless it can be demonstrated through consultation with the NGA Network providers that this would not be possible, practical or commercially viable. In such circumstances, suitable ducting should be provided within the site and to the property to facilitate future installation.</p>	<p>Policy LB/IC/2 proposes that new development be served by full fibre broadband unless it can be demonstrated in consultation with the NGA Network provider that this would not be possible, practical or commercial viable.</p> <p>Paragraph 114 of the Framework says planning policies should support the expansion of electronic communications networks, including next generation mobile technology (such as 5G) and full fibre broadband connections. Policies should set out how high quality digital infrastructure, providing access to services from a range of providers, is expected to be delivered and upgraded over time; and should prioritise full fibre connections to existing and new developments (as these connections will, in almost all cases, provide the optimum solution).</p> <p>Policy SWDP 26A says new development should be provided with superfast broadband or alternative solutions where appropriate, e.g. mobile broadband and / or Wi-Fi. Wherever practicable, superfast broadband capacity should be incorporated to agreed industry standards. Developers and infrastructure providers should seek to facilitate this through early engagement.</p> <p>It is considered that Policy LB/IC/2 has regard to the Framework and is in general conformity with SWDP 26A.</p> <p>It is suggested that some elements of paragraph 5.5.9, such as reference reducing congestion, accidents, pollution etc are not directly relevant.</p> <p>Response: We consider that this paragraph highlights the more general importance for the accessibility to high speed broadband connections and reliable mobile signals, particularly in rural areas. Home working in particular reduces traffic and pollution. NHS gave positive comments about this text</p>

<p>LB/IC/3 - Communications</p> <p>Improvement and development of new mobile telecommunication infrastructure will be supported provided that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Its design and placement seeks to minimise impact on the visual amenity, character or appearance of the surrounding area; and 2. Its design and siting does not have an unacceptable effect on historical features and buildings, visually sensitive landscape or views. 	<p>Policy LB/IC/3 supports the development or improvement of mobile telecommunication infrastructure, subject to the following 2 criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the design and placement seeks to minimise impact on the visual amenity, character or appearance of the surrounding area; and 2. the design and siting not having an unacceptable effect on historical features and buildings, visually sensitive landscape or views. <p>Paragraph 115 of the Framework says that the number of radio and electronic communications masts, and the sites for such installations, should be kept to a minimum consistent with the needs of consumers, the efficient operation of the network and providing reasonable capacity for future expansion. Use of existing masts, buildings and other structures for new electronic communications capability (including wireless) should be encouraged. Where new sites are required (such as for new 5G networks, or for connected transport and smart city applications), equipment should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged where appropriate.</p> <p>To keep the number of installations to a minimum in accordance with the Framework it is suggested that the following criteria be added – <i>“Where freestanding new masts are proposed, it is demonstrated that there are no viable options for siting the equipment on or in existing buildings or structures.”</i> Response: Amended as suggested</p>
<p>Policy LB/IMA/4 – Moving Around</p> <p>Where possible, new housing should be designed to ensure that it connects safely to local amenities, and the existing footway, cycleway, and footpath network.</p>	<p>Policy LB/IMA/4 encourages the design of housing development to connect to local amenities and connect to existing footways, cycleways and footpath network.</p> <p>Paragraph 92a of the Framework says planning policies should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which promote social interaction, including opportunities for meetings between people who might not otherwise come into contact with each other – for example through mixed-</p>

	<p>use developments, strong neighbourhood centres, street layouts that allow for easy pedestrian and cycle connections within and between neighbourhoods, and active street frontages.</p> <p>The intention of Policy LB/IMA/4 is laudable and is considered to have regard to paragraph 92a of the Framework and be consistent with SWDP 21Bix.</p> <p>The application of Policy LB/IMA/4 will depend on a case-by-case basis. If connectivity is considered to be an important issue to the community it is suggested that the need for connectivity is identified as a specific criteria in the proposed site allocation for 52 dwellings off the A4103 (Policy LB/H/5). Response: An amended version of LB/IMA/4 has been added to LB/H/5; we think the duplication is warranted.</p> <p>It is considered that paragraphs 5.5.12 – 5.5.18 are not relevant to Policy LB/IMA/4. The purpose of Policy LB/IMA/4 is to ensure that new development connects to local amenities by walking or cycling. The proposed policy will not address the issues outlined in paragraphs 5.5.12 – 5.5.17 – ie lack of bus services, rail stations, distance from doctors surgery and hospitals in Worcester and Malvern etc. Paragraph 5.5.18 says “Several key footway / cycle routes do not exist ...”. Policy LB/IMA/4 does not address this issue, nor does the Neighbourhood Plan propose any specific footways / cycleways. Response: The proposed allocation will not impact on the footway/cycleway but future developments could. Text amended to include reference to Local Transport Plan</p>
<p>5.6 Amenities, Health and Well Being</p>	
<p>LB/AHWB/1 – Community Facilities</p> <p>The following are identified as important community facilities in the Plan area:</p>	<p>Policy LB/AHWB/1 resists the loss of the Royal Oak Public House unless it can be demonstrated that the proposal meets the criteria in SWDP Policy 37B (or its successor).</p> <p>Paragraph 93c of the Framework says planning policies should plan</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Royal Oak Public house, Leigh Sinton (Asset of Community Value) <p>Any proposal that would result in the loss of any of these community facilities will only be supported if the criteria set out in SWDP Policy 37B or successor Policies are met.</p>	<p>positively for community facilities and guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services.</p> <p>Policy LB/AHWB/1 is in general conformity with SWDP 37B.</p> <p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not clear why the Royal Oak public house is the only community facility that Policy LB/AHWB/1 seeks to protect when other facilities, such as the Memorial Hall, local shop and school are mentioned as valued services and facilities in the Reasoned Justification. Response: Additional facilities added. If the Royal Oak is to be the only community facility covered by the policy then references to “facilities” should be amended to “facility”. To provide clarity it is suggested that the location of the facility/facilities covered by Policy LB/AHWB/1 are shown on a map. Response: Map now included Paragraphs 5.6.3 and 5.6.4 make references to a 2021 Housing Needs Survey, together with a lack of footways and lack of public transport. The relevance of these to resisting the loss of the Royal Oak is unclear. Response: The text refers to the community views on general facilities. This may impact on future developments Paragraph 5.6.2 refers to community amenities / facilities listed in Appendix C. This should be Appendix F. Response: Corrected
<p>LB/AHWB/2 – Community Facilities</p> <p>The provision of new built community facilities or the enhancement of</p>	<p>Policy LB/AHWB/2 supports the enhancement of existing community facilities or the provision of new community facilities, subject to the</p>

<p>existing facilities will be required to demonstrate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the siting, scale and design respects the character of the surrounding area, including any historic and natural assets; and b. the local road network can accommodate the additional traffic without compromising highway safety, and; c. adequate off-road vehicle and cycle parking is provided on the site. 	<p>following 3 criteria being met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Siting, scale and design respecting the character of the surrounding area (including any historic and natural assets); and b. Local road network being able to safely accommodate the additional traffic, and c. Adequate off-road vehicle / cycle parking being provided on site. <p>Paragraph 93a of the Framework says to provide the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies should plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments.</p> <p>It is considered that Policy LB/AHWB/2 helpfully sets out criteria against which proposals for the enhancement of existing community facilities or provision of new community facilities would be assessed. However, it is suggested that Policy LB/AHWB/2 includes an additional criterion that “there will be no significant adverse impact on residential amenity”.</p> <p>Response: Corrected as suggested</p>
<p>LB/AHWB/3</p> <p>In accordance with the South Worcestershire Supplementary Planning Document, Planning for Health(19), Health Impact Assessments (HIA) will be required for development proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential and mixed use sites of 25 or more dwellings 	<p>Policy LB/AHWB/3 proposes that a Health Impact Assessment be required for all developments that exceed the following thresholds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential and mixed use sites of 25 or more dwellings • Employment sites of 5 hectares or greater

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment sites of 5 hectares or greater • Retail developments of 500 square metres or more. • Any other proposals considered by the local planning authority to require a HIA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail developments of 500 square metres or more. • Any other proposals considered by the local planning authority to require a HIA. <p>Paragraph 92c of the Framework says planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs – for example through the provision of safe and accessible green infrastructure, sports facilities, local shops, access to healthier food, allotments and layouts that encourage walking and cycling.</p> <p>The South Worcestershire Planning for Health in South Worcestershire SPD (September 217) requires a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) for residential and mixed use sites of 25+ dwellings, employment sites of 5+ ha and retail developments of 500+ square metres.</p> <p>In light of the above, the principle of Policy LB/AHWB/3 appears to have regard to national policy and be in general conformity with the SWDP.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that HIA's are a policy tool and simply undertaking a HIA does not indicate whether a development proposal should be supported. It is considered that either the policy or supporting text should make clear that development proposals should demonstrate how they have addressed the health and wellbeing principles in the HIA to be supported. Response: Text amended as suggested</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Appendix A - Cross Referencing of Policies

It is not clear why only 11 of the 31 proposed policies are cross referenced. For consistency, it is suggested that Appendix A cross references all of the NDP policies or is deleted. **Response: Deleted**

Appendix B - Parish Tasks

Planning Practice Guidance says wider community aspirations than those relating to the development and use of land, if set out as part of the plan, would need to be clearly identifiable (for example, set out in a companion document or annex), and it should be made clear in the document that they will not form part of the statutory development plan.

It is considered that the list of Parish Tasks in Appendix B is clearly identifiable and will not form part of the statutory development plan.

It is suggested that the title of the Appendix be amended to **Proposed Parish Council Tasks** to make clear that they are proposed (ie provides some flexibility) and they are actions for the Parish Council. **Response: Amended**

Regarding Task 2, it is suggested that the identification of potential non-designated heritage assets is separate from the action to liaise with the community about actions to maintain the historic and rural landscape.

Response: Amended

Appendix C - Historic Environment Records (HER) Surveys For Leigh and Bransford	
	<p>It is suggested that relevant evidence from the Historic Environment Records could be used to provide robust, proportionate evidence to support heritage policies related to archaeology and historic farmsteads.</p> <p>Response: Noted</p>
Appendix D - Ecological Search for the Leigh and Bransford Neighbourhood Plan: Worcestershire County Council	
	<p>It is suggested that relevant evidence from the Ecological Search for Leigh and Bransford be used to provide robust, proportionate evidence to support the biodiversity policies, particularly LB/HLB/8.</p> <p>Response: Noted</p>
Appendix E - Potential Criteria for Assessing the Visual Value of Views	
	<p>It is suggested that the word "Potential" be removed from the title of Appendix E. Response: Amended</p>
Appendix F - Community Facilities	
Appendix G - Bibliography	
Appendix H - Criteria for Assessing Potential Development Sites	
	<p>The process and criteria for assessing potentially suitable sites for housing development is very important. The information in Appendix H is therefore important.</p>

	<p>When the Neighbourhood Plan is made, the location and assessment of sites not allocated will not be material considerations. It is therefore suggested that consideration is given to including information on the site selection process in a separate Background Report rather than including it as an Appendix. Response: Agreed</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

APPENDIX 4: Responses from Consultees

Response number and Consultee	Support/ Object/ Comment	Details of Consultee Response	Parish Council Response
1. Herefordshire Council	S	Thank you for consulting the Herefordshire Council’s Neighbourhood Planning Team, following our review, we have no objection or comments to make in regards to the draft Leigh and Bransford Neighbourhood Plan.	Acknowledged
2. STWA: Rebecca McLEAn	C	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your consultation, we have the following specific comments to make regarding your neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Policy LB/H/5 Housing: Site Allocation – There are no known issues in the downstream sewer network for this site, however due to the size of this development in relation to the existing network we recommend that developers contact Severn Trent at the earliest opportunity to agree connection point and to ensure that there is time for hydraulic modelling and network reinforcements should they be required.</p> <p>We recommend that surface water is managed sustainably through SuDS following the drainage hierarchy. Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 80 (Reference ID: 7-080-20150323) states:</p> <p>“Generally the aim should be to discharge surface water run off as high up the following hierarchy of drainage options as reasonably practicable:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. into the ground (infiltration); 2. to a surface water body; 3. to a surface water sewer, highway drain, or another drainage system; 4. to a combined sewer.” <p>A desktop assessment of the site indicates there may be a concern regarding surface water connections, should it not be feasible to drain the full site through infiltration. Further investigation is encouraged to determine if there is a feasible ditch or watercourse where surface water flows from the development can discharge to. The nearest surface water sewer is ~100m from the site boundary, however levels from the site indicate that a pumped</p> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drainage policy includes management by SuDS • Suggested water saving policy is already in the SWDP • Your additional text on Flooding and Drainage is included • Landscape policies include protection of ditches • Unfortunately we had to withdraw our GI policy but the key elements to which you refer are now in other policies.

discharge may be required to connect to the nearest surface water sewer. A connection of surface water to the foul sewer should be avoided, and if required sufficient evidence will be required to demonstrate why it is the only feasible connection.

Policy LB/D/1 Design: Maintaining Local Character – Regarding bullet point b. in this policy Severn Trent is supportive of energy efficient and sustainable design, however we recommend that this policy is extended (or an additional policy added) to specifically include Water Efficient Design. New development will result in a need for an increase in the amount of water to be supplied across the Severn Trent region, and issues with the sustainability of some of our water sources are placing our supply resilience at risk. It is therefore vital that we reduce the amount of water used. We are supportive of the use of water efficient fittings and appliances within new properties, we encourage of the optional higher water efficiency target of 110 Litres per person per day within part G of building regulations. Delivering against the optional higher target or better provides wider benefits to the water cycle and environment as a whole. This approach is not only the most sustainable but the most appropriate direction to deliver water efficiency. We therefore encourage inclusion of the following policy wording:

‘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. Developments should demonstrate that they are water efficient, where possible incorporating innovative water efficiency and water re-use measures ‘

LB/HLB/1 Landscape - Severn Trent acknowledge the need retain existing hedgerows and trees, however these are not the only natural features that need to be protected.

We would therefore recommend that watercourses are also included as features to protect. Watercourses, including dry ditches, form a vital part of the water cycle and enable developments to discharge surface water in a sustainable way. Watercourses should be retained in open space where they provide valuable habitats and resources for wildlife, and also minimises flood risk.

		<p>LB/HLB/2 Landscape: Local Green Space – Severn Trent are supportive of Local Green Spaces, it is important that planning policy does not prevent flood resilience works from being carried out if required in the future. Green spaces can also be enhanced where a good SuDS, scheme that incorporates design principles to enhance biodiversity and Amenity as well as attenuation. We would therefore recommend the following policy wording is added: <i>‘Development of flood resilience schemes within local green spaces will be supported provided the schemes do not adversely impact the primary function of the green space.’</i></p> <p>LB/GI/1 Green Infrastructure – Severn Trent is supportive of this policy particularly the flood risk and water quality management reference.</p> <p>LB/IFD/1 Infrastructure: Flooding and Drainage – Severn Trent is supportive of this policy, particularly inclusion of SuDS to sustainably manage surface water from new developments. We would encourage you to include the following policy wording to ensure that the drainage hierarchy is followed: <i>‘All applications for new development shall demonstrate that all surface water discharges have been carried out in accordance with the principles laid out within the drainage hierarchy, in such that a discharge to the public sewerage systems are avoided, where possible.’</i></p> <p>Correspondence also included standard planning guidance</p>	
3. Diane Clarke Network Rail		Standard Planning Guidance	Acknowledged
4. Hall, Jo (NHS Herefordshire and Worcestershire CCG)	S	Thank you for notifying Herefordshire & Worcestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) of the consultation on Leigh and Bransford Parish Council’s Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Pre-Submission. Herefordshire & Worcestershire CCG has no direct comment on the plan, but welcome the policy promoting improved broadband and telecommunications infrastructure which is of benefit to the provision of healthcare into rural communities.	Acknowledged
5, Jane Nennell: Canal and River Trust	C	No comment	Acknowledged

<p>6. Resident: Mr and Mrs Thorogood</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>We are aware that the Draft Plan includes 30 policies. We are also in full agreement that any new developments need to be appropriately designed, provide a net gain in biodiversity and protect the local heritage and landscape. It is also important to us that the policies for Green infrastructure, the protection of key views, proposes the 7. Resident designation of two new Local Green Spaces, infrastructure and energy, and amenities and well-being. You have our total support in these matters</p>	<p>Acknowledged</p>
<p>7. Resident :Mr and Mrs Bernard</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Leigh Sinton is a village and not part of Malvern. I strongly support the retention of the significant gap between Malvern and Leigh Sinton with protection of existing green space.</p> <p>Recent developments in particular, the housing off Kiln Lane and on the A4103 as you exit the village to Hereford have significantly increased the population and demands on school etc. I strongly support the limitation of future developments to one designated site within the existing Leigh Sinton Development Boundary. The site specified as land off A4103 opposite Leigh & Bransford Primary School. Plans for this area being 52 dwellings and open space for sports and recreation use has already been tabled. I support this.</p> <p>New housing development in open countryside outside the proposed development boundary should only be considered under exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Any new development should be appropriately designed, protect the local heritage and landscape, provide net gain in biodiversity and follow appropriate policies for green infrastructure, the protection of key views, infrastructure and energy and amenities and well being</p>	<p>Acknowledged</p>
<p>8. Resident: Michael Green</p>		<p>I support the plan policies and specifically that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Significant Gap between Malvern and Leigh Sinton will be maintained and the protection of Local Green Space • Large housing development is limited to one designated siteand it includes oopen space for sports and recreation • The introduction of a pedestrian crossing on the A4103 	<p>Acknowledged</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any further housing development in open countryside will only be considered in exceptional circumstances 	
9. Resident Mr Rhys Humm		There is a current proposal to put new housing into the Christmas Tree farm, adjacent to the recently built Cala Homes Development. This is not on the Development Plan and should not be considered as 'exceptional circumstances' when there exists a feasible section of development within the plan, opposite the school off the A4103. This particular plan off the A4103 will provide recreation and sports use as well as much needed pedestrian crossing that will serve as a traffic calming too. The proposed build off of the Cala homes section of Kiln Lane will be detrimental to local biodiversity with a number of animals, large and small, frequently sighted in there. I personally have seen bats, rabbits, voles and newts at various times there.	Acknowledged
10. Resident: Miss G Lawrence	S	The plans to develop on this area will impact the roads and households around the proposed site. The play area in the Cala homes development is not large enough to be shared with new neighbouring sites. Impacting views will result in a decline in house prices for the households existing there. There have already been two new developments in Leigh Sinton, which has already changed the area dramatically; a further development will damage the community.	Acknowledged
11. Mr T Fuller	S	Need to keep Significant Gap. Only build on one designated site.	Acknowledged
12. Mr J Williams: PlanIt for client	C/O	Land Partnership Developments represent the owners of land in Leigh Sinton (referred to as Site CFS0009). We welcome the opportunity to comment of the Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood Plan for Leigh and Bransford and the initiative of the parish council in preparing the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) which will enable the local community to influence development in their local area. The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group will be aware that we have promoted this site for development through stages of the NP preparation, as well as the SWDP Review process, and we have presented it to Parish Council meetings and through a public consultation event held in June 2017. We	LB/D/1 "Enhance and reinforce" has been amended to enhance and retain" Parking standards have been discussed and agreed with WCC All other points noted.

request that this consultation is acknowledged at paragraph 1.8 of the Plan. Our comments on the NP are generally supportive and we wish to make the following comments on specific policies and objectives of the Plan. It is clear that the draft Plan has been prepared with regard to the SWDP (adopted in 2016). The NP will need to be prepared in accordance with the Basic Conditions required of a Neighbourhood Plan as set out in Paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. This includes consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the promotion of sustainable development (which is again best defined in the NPPF) and ensuring general consistency with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area (in this instance the SWDP).

1. Plan Objectives.

We support the 19 objectives at page 9 of the NP, in particular:

- the promotion and provision of new community sport and leisure facilities(objective 4) which is so important for the general health and well-being; and
- the protection of the significant gap (objective 5) which is an important landscape designation which ensures that the village of Leigh Sinton remains separated from Malvern town.

2. Policy LB/H/1 We support policy LB/H/1 and the extension of existing Development Boundary in Leigh Sinton which is shown on Maps 2 and 4a.

3. Policy LB/H/4 We support Policy LB/H/4 and the retention of the Significant Gap (as indicated on Maps 3 and 3a) between Malvern and Leigh Sinton in order to maintain the separation and identify of Leigh Sinton and Malvern.

4. Policy LB/H/5 We support Policy LB/H/5 which allocates Site CFS0009, Land off the A4103, Leigh Sinton (indicated on Map 2) for a mix of residential and sports and recreation uses. This site will make an important contribution to the housing requirement and will help to deliver the Plan’s strategic objective for improved local facilities. We confirm that land within Site CFS0009 will be made available for the distribution of residential and community land uses in the proportions which are set out

		<p>in policy LB/H/5. The Site will also include affordable housing to comply with this policy and also with policy SWDP 15 which currently sets a target of 40% provision.</p> <p>5. Policy LB/D/1 We wish to suggest a small change to the wording in policy LB/D/1. As drafted, the opening sentence reads: <i>“a. Proposals for new developments should provide evidence to show how they will enhance and reinforce the local distinctiveness of an area”</i>. The words ‘enhance’ and ‘reinforce’ are not defined and this makes the policy difficult to interpret.</p> <p>The second sentence in this policy appears to achieve the desired policy objectives. We suggest therefore that the first and last sentences in Policy LB/D/1 (a) are unnecessary and should be deleted.</p> <p>6. Policy LB/D/ This policy refers to car parking standards within the Worcestershire County Council’s Streetscape Design Guide (Spring 2020). Clearly those standards may be update and changed over the plan period; the policy should acknowledge that the relevant latest standards will be applied. Regarding visitor parking, we note that the Streetscape Design Guide states the following (Page 34): <i>“These are permitted to be counted within the street due to their short term duration and infrequent occurrence. Where existing on street demand or parking restriction prevents this or for communal parking areas off road provision should be made at a ratio of 1 space per 5 bedrooms.</i> Therefore, in the absence of evidence that there is heavy on street demand or parking restrictions, we suggest that the Neighbourhood Plan should simply state that parking provision should comply with the WCC Streetscape Design Guide. If there is local visitor parking problem which will be exacerbated by the development, then the Design Guide policy will be able to address the point per the policy which we have quoted above.</p>	
13. Mr R Beard	S	If more of the Local Green Spaces are built on there would be no infrastructure to complement it such as schools, shops, buses which would mean more traffic around Leigh Sinton to Malvern etc, the	Acknowledged

		<p>traffic at the present moment is building up to a dangerous situation especially on Malvern Road at the 30 mph section and the corner by the 30 mph sign which I find, being a few yards from it, precarious when exiting my drive. I feel that Leigh sinton cannot cope with situation that will occur in the future if the planning is aproved.</p>	
<p>14. Mr S Holloway, Fisher German for Worcester Diocese</p>	O	<p>Neighbourhood Plan: Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation response</p> <p>Fisher German LLP have been instructed by the Diocese of Worcester to make formal representation to the Leigh and Bransford Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP)Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Consultation. The representation is not to be seen as a wider consideration of the pre-submission plan and is only focused on matters of material interest to the Diocese of Worcester.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Diocese of Worcester have a fiduciary duty to maximise land value for the benefit of the Clergy Stipends Fund. As such this letter will provide considered response to the Local Green Spaces policy LB/HLB/2 and the proposed allocation of local green space 1 (Meadow Land adjacent to Brockamin Lane).</p> <p>For clarity it is outlined at this point that the Diocese of Worcester object to the proposed green space designation. The justification for which is provided below.</p> <p>Local Green Spaces – Policy LB/HLB/2</p> <p>As indicated in the within paragraph 5.3.7 of the Neighbourhood Plan, guidance for green space designations is provided within paragraphs 101 to 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p> <p>These paragraphs state –</p> <p>Para 101The 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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>The site has not been put forward on grounds of heritage or biodiversity. Whilst the footpaths may be considered as linear features the area proposed for LGS is not. It is partly the setting of the footpaths in the open quiet space with its wider views that adds to the recreational value.</p>

		<p>Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.</p> <p>Para 102 The Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves - demonstrably special to a local community and holds particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field) tranquility or richness of its wildlife; and - local in character and is not an extensive tract of land <p>Para 103 Policies for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with those for Green Belts</p> <p>In consideration of the above, and specifically NPPF paragraph 102, it is clear that new green space designations need to accord with the 3 criteria outlined as well as confirming that the Green Space is capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period in accordance with paragraph 101 of the NPPF. These matters should be demonstrated through the compilation and submission of robust the justified evidence in the plan making process. The regulation 14 submission document describes the proposed local green space 1 (Meadow Land adjacent to Brockamin Lane) as being ...'immediately adjacent to the edge of the main body of dwellings in Bransford, local in character, and is a relatively small parcel of land. It is valued in its own right within the landscape and for the access it provides to the larger local area. This area is crossed by a public footpath and is widely used by local walkers and dog walkers'...</p> <p>In review of the above there is no disagreement with the conclusions made in regard to the proposed green space being adjacent the settlement edge or the site being local in character. The proposed designation would therefore meet the requirement of criteria 1 and 3 of paragraph 102.</p>	
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>In consideration of criterion 2, the regulation 14 submission document has been supported by 3 additional survey documents. The Historic Environmental Record Surveys for Bransford, the Ecological Search for Leigh and Bransford and a summarised NDP survey report. In the absence of any other survey evidence, it is considered that these documents form the main evidential basis for the proposed green space in relation to criterion 2. On review of the Historic Environmental Record Surveys for Bransford it is clear that no significant heritage is confirmed within the proposed green space area with only geological mapping for Palaeolithic potential at the southern aspect of the proposed green space. There is no building, monument or landscape component found or documented within the proposed green space.</p> <p>The closest heritage monument is to the immediate north west of the proposed green space and relates to a double row tree avenue which is believed to be a small surviving section of greenway. This asset is, however, not included within the green space proposal. On the basis of the above the site as proposed is not found to hold any local significance for heritage reasons.</p> <p>In consideration of the Ecological Search for Leigh and Bransford it is noted that the proposed green space is a mapped area of semi natural and priority grassland. However, upon review of the Worcestershire Habitat Inventory mapping it is apparent that the site is only classified as 'possibly unimproved grassland' To meet the definition of unimproved grassland the site would need to have never been ploughed, reseeded or heavily fertilised. The site in question has been in agricultural use for a number of years and it is therefore not likely to be unimproved grassland.</p> <p>On the basis of the above, the wildlife found within the site is likely to be very minimal and could not be defined as a rich area for wildlife. In regard to the sites recreational value, a review of the NDP survey has been undertaken and there is no evidence within the document that any of the 36 respondents from Bransford area hold the site</p>	
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>significant for the purpose of recreation.</p> <p>There is mention of the site in relation to the creation of a village green, but this does not hold any weight in the consideration of how people view or utilise the site at present. There is no question or evidence provided to the level of use of the footpath and it should be noted that this is a linear feature across the field for which the wider recreational use of the site would not be permitted. It is important to note that the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) within paragraph 018(ref ID:37-018-20140306) states that ...'there is no need to designate linear corridors as Local Green Space simply to protect rights of way, which are already protected under other legislation'...Whilst the green space is not proposed in a linear shape, if the main evidential basis for the allocation is the protection of the public right of way, the above guidance makes it clear that protection should be maintained through the existing, other legislation that protects public rights of way.</p> <p>Overall, based on the evidence provided and reviewed, it cannot be seen that the proposed open space is demonstrably special to a local community or holds particular local significance.</p> <p>The proposal therefore fails to accord with criterion 2 of paragraph 102 to the NPPF and should not be progressed as a site for open space designation.</p> <p>As an additional point of consideration, it should also be noted that the site was progressed to the recent South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP) review, call for sites. Whilst it was not chosen as a site for allocation, the reason for omission was focused on the scale of the site as a whole coming forward.</p> <p>It is therefore possible that a future progression of a section of the site would be better received and as such it is not certain that the entire area of the proposed green space will endure beyond the end of the plan period. The context of a rural exception site for example would be broadly policy compliant and consistent with how green belt policy permits built development in accordance with paragraph</p>	
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>103 of the NPPF</p> <p>The proposed green space designation is therefore also in conflict with paragraph 101 of the NPPF.</p> <p>For the reasons outlined the Diocese of the Worcester formally object to the proposed green space designation and request its removal from the NDP moving forward. Notwithstanding this objection, the Diocese of Worcester would welcome further engagement with the NDP group to assist with the progression of the Leigh and Bransford NDP.</p>	
<p>15. Mrs M Farr and Mr G Froggatt</p>		<p>The proposed development boundary extension is too restrictive. There are several arguments in favour of extending the proposed development boundary to include the parcel of land referenced by the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment 2019 (SHELAA) CFS0105 Land to the north edge of Leigh Sinton next to Upper House Farm, Sherridge Road, Leigh Sinton, Malvern, Worcestershire WR13 5DA.</p> <p>This was one of 10 sites considered by Malvern Hills District Council during the 2018/19 SWDP Review. Out of that 10, it was one of only 3 which was a site 'suitable for development'.</p> <p>Further arguments for extending the proposed development boundary to include the site CFS0105 include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land is contiguous with the existing development boundary. 2. Land is in the centre of the village. 3. It is well served by footpaths. 4. Any potential development would not impinge on the Significant Gap as described in the Neighbourhood Plan Policy LB/H/4. 5. Any potential development would not impact on key views of the Malvern Hills NP Policy LB/HLB/3. 6. This would be a smaller development (4.75 hectares of land available) in comparison with the plot referenced CFS0009 Land off A4103 (total 5.69 hectares) and more attractive because it does not skirt the A4103. A4103 access is potentially achievable for site CFS0105 as recognised by MHDC's Review or there is alternative access using new access put in place in 2005, as part of The Upper 	<p>The proposed revisions to the boundaries of the Development Area are consistent with the rationale used by South Worcestershire Counties/ MHDC in the emerging SWDP Revision.</p> <p>At this stage it would be pre-emptive to include sites currently outside that boundary.</p>

		<p>House redevelopment.</p> <p>7. Any potential development could include green space or meadow area or a playground for children in the centre of the village not far from the school.</p> <p>8. The NP identifies services not represented in Leigh Sinton, there being no Doctor's surgery or pharmacy. One or both could be incorporated into any plans put forward for CFS0105 and so provide centrally located services.</p>	
16. Mrs M Farr and Mr G Froggatt		<p>The Neighbourhood Plan's preferred site for potential development, referenced CFS0009 is for approximately 52 dwellings.</p> <p>We object to such a large number of dwellings on the edge of the village. We feel that it is not in keeping with Policy LB/D/1 NP Policies and Design – Maintaining the local character.</p> <p>The development would skirt the A4103, a modern development which would not look attractive on approaching the village from Worcester.</p> <p>Leigh Sinton does not have the infrastructure for such a large development. The large Cala Homes development already stretches resources.</p>	<p>The dwellings are a strategic allocation by MHDC. A Neighbourhood Plan cannot seek to reduce development. The proposed site for allocation was determined following an objective assessment of sites.</p>
17. Mrs Bolton: Environment Agency	C	General Planning Guidance	Acknowledged
18. Resident: Mr T Norton		<p>5.3.14 An area of Leigh is designated as a Conservation Area (See Map7). Every local authority is obliged under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to prepare conservation area appraisals and management strategies, including a review of boundaries. At the time of this report there is no adopted appraisal for Leigh.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could the plan explain the point of having such a conservation area? Is it solely to stop property development or is wildlife conservation a consideration? • It would be helpful to have an explanation of what the 	<p>Responded with general information about Conservation Areas and Leigh conservation Area in particular.</p>

		<p>designation means for the residents of the conservation area – rights and obligations, do’s and don’ts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When will the appraisal and management strategy referred to above be done? 	
20: Residents: MS E Haffield, Ms H Haffield, Ms M Haffield, Mr C Haffield (Separate Responses)	S	<p>The Significant Gap between Malvern and Leigh Sinton will be retained, along with protection of existing Local Green Space. Large housing development will be limited to one designated site, within the existing Leigh Sinton Development Boundary. The site is specified as land off the A4103, opposite Leigh & Bransford Primary School and allocates circa half the site for 52 dwellings and half as open space for sports and recreation use. This also introduces the requirement for a pedestrian crossing on the A4103, which will act as a traffic calming measure.</p> <p>New housing development in open countryside, outside the proposed Development Boundary, will only be considered under exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Any new development should be appropriately designed, protect the local heritage and landscape, provide a net gain in biodiversity and follow appropriate policies for Green Infrastructure, the protection of key views, infrastructure and energy, and amenities and well-being.</p>	Acknowledged
21. Resident: Mr D Tipton	S	<p>Support the Significant Gap between Leigh Sinton and Malvern to protect green space. Support the development opposite Leigh and Bransford School – land off A4103 to include pedestrian- crossing – traffic needs to be slowed down on A4103. Support “Leigh Sinton for Green Space”</p>	Acknowledged
22. Resident: Mrs J Fryer		<p>The Significant Gap must be retained to enable the character of the area, and the beautiful outstanding views to be maintained. The existing green spaces should be protected to enhance these aims also. Large housing development should be restricted to one designated site, land off the A4103, opposite Leigh and Bransford Primary School. New housing development outside this area should</p>	Acknowledged

		only be considered in very exceptional circumstances. Any new development should be designed to protect the local heritage and landscape.	
23. Mr H Harbord WCC Senior Flood Risk Management Officer	S	<p>Many thanks for letting us have a look at your drafted Leigh and Bransford Neighbourhood Plan of September 2021.</p> <p>Clear and comprehensive, the section on flooding and drainage is a good piece of work.</p> <p>Commenting on this section, in my Lead Local Flood Authority role, I would suggest only a few small tweaks:</p> <p>Page 66; Policy table LB/IFD/1; policy a)...Adopt the general principles of the CIRIA Report C753, "The SuDS Manual".</p> <p>In case the guidance is updated, It might be useful to add: "or any subsequent CIRIA SuDS guidance". And you might want to consider directing the reader to our own SuDS guidance/ require that all developments comply with it, which can be found here. (Again, with the add-on "or any subsequent WCC SuDS guidance".)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. I think by "...compared with the pre-development situation" the intention is to mean the run-off from the new development should be reduced compared to the brownfield site runoff: if this is the case it might be better to say "...compared with the brownfield situation", as 'pre-development' could be taken to mean before the site was first developed. d. Worcestershire County Council's policy is that soakaways are the first choice, only to be ruled-out when shown to not work by on-site permeability testing. I note that the text (later on in the flooding and drainage section) suggests that the local soil type is unlikely to support the adoption of soakaways. I wouldn't suggest that text needs changing overly (perhaps change "...will not be practicable in most cases" to "...might not be practicable."), but I would ask for "If required" to be removed from section d, otherwise the section could be at odds with our own policy. e. I definitely agree that it is vital to have a maintenance plan in place. When looking at planning applications we usually ask that agreements are signed by the body (usually a grounds maintenance 	Acknowledged: Amended as suggested.

		<p>company) that will be bound to enact the plan, for the duration of the development, so that the planners have someone to chase should things get overlooked.</p> <p>To reinforce the importance of e), perhaps change the final sentence of Section 5.5.7 to “Proposals must ensure appropriate maintenance...”? (Currently says: “Proposals should...”.)</p>	
<p>24. Mr S Rees, AddisonRees Consultancy for Mrs M Farr and Mr G Froggatt</p>	O	<p>The focus of this objection is with regards to the Housing: Site Allocation Policy LB/H/5. This policy seeks to allocate approximately 52 dwellings on ‘Land off the A4103, Leigh Sinton’.</p> <p>Whilst this site has been identified in the Council’s SWDP Local Plan Review as the preferred option, there are significant planning constraints, which make this allocation unsuitable for Leigh Sinton. The proposed allocation is extensive in area covering 8.64ha according to the Draft SWDP Preferred Options Document. This would be a major development on the edge of the village, which will alter the existing character and form of Leigh Sinton.</p> <p>For example, this proposed allocation is double the size of the proposed site CFS0105 and would extend significantly beyond the boundary of the village to the north.</p> <p>Heritage Matters -</p> <p>One of the biggest constraints of the proposed allocation is its proximity to a number of important heritage assets. This is especially the case for such a large expanse of the development. The site lies directly opposite four Grade II listed buildings as shown below.</p> <p>The four listed buildings are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ahimsa – Listing description - II House. Possibly c1600 with C15 remains. Timber-framing with brick infill and tile roof. Comprises a cross-wing and the truncated remains of a cruck hall. Two storeys. Windows are C20 casements. Front gable of wing has one window on the ground floor and two on first floor. The tie-beam is interrupted 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The impact on designated assets was considered by MHDC, after discussion with Historic England. The Screening Opinion concluded that a Strategic Environmental Assessment was not required. 2. The access to A4103 will be away from the bend, closer to the school. It understood access to the development has been the subject of discussion with Worcestershire County Council. 3. All available sites were assessed as indicated in the NP.

and there are V-struts above the collar. The left-hand (east) wall of this wing is framed in square panels. The rear gable wall has a tie-beam, collar, and vertical struts. The west wall of the truncated hall range has exposed cruck blades with a tie-beam, a collar interrupted by a first floor window and blades truncated at an upper collar. Doorway to right of ground floor window.

- Sinton House Farmhouse – Listing description - House. Probably mid-C19 with late C18 remains. Brick with hipped tile roof. Two storeys. South front of three bays with sashed windows. Those on the ground floor have segmental heads. Central bay has single-storey glazed porch on brick base with hipped tile roof. End chimneys. Two wings at rear have casement windows of C18 type.

- The Oast House – Listing description - Hop kilns and barn, now house. Mid-C19, with early C18 remains and C20 alterations. Brick and timber-framing with tile roof. East wall has one bay at left of two storeys with an attic lit by a dormer. Adjoining at the left are two circular hop kilns with conical rendered roofs. The front kiln has two windows inserted on the ground floor and one on the first floor. To the right is a lower range, formerly a barn. It has five windows on the ground floor and three attic dormers. Door to right of first window, under an open tiled porch. The north and west walls of the former barn have exposed timber-framing in three rows of square panels. Included for group value.

- Iris Cottage, Jasmine Cottage & Peony Cottage – Listing description - Three houses. Circa 1700. Timber-framing and brick with tile roof. Framed in three rows of square panels, with some brick replacement in right-hand bay. One storey with attic, three bays. Windows are C20 casements. Three attic dormers. Door to right of second window. End chimneys, the left-hand one in front of ridge.

		<p>The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 under section 66 outlines a general duty as to listed buildings in the exercise of planning functions.</p> <p>It is law when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.</p> <p>It is therefore essential that any allocation has due regard to the impact upon the setting of the adjacent four Grade II listed buildings. Paragraph 194 of the updated National Planning Policy Framework (2021) states that:</p> <p><i>“In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets’ importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation”.</i></p> <p>Has the Parish Council or the landowner undertaken an Assessment of Significance for the proposed allocation? If no assessment has been carried out, this would mean that the Neighbourhood Plan has failed to apply the duty required by law under section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.</p> <p>It is clear that a major development for approximately 52 dwellings with sport and recreation facilities will have a significant impact upon the setting of the adjacent listed buildings.</p>	
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>With the above in mind, any future application would need to be assessed against the relevant heritage policies of the Neighbourhood Plan, SWDP and national guidance.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework outlines under paragraph 199 that <i>“When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance”</i>.</p> <p>Paragraph 200 sets out that <i>“Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification...”</i>.</p> <p>Any harm associated with the proposed allocation upon the surrounding heritage assets would carry substantial weight in any decision making process. Therefore, as set out in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 section 66, there is a duty bestowed on the decision maker to have regard to the impact of any development upon the setting of the listed buildings.</p> <p>There is no evidence that this duty has been carried out in the case of Site Allocation Policy LB/H/5 - ‘Land off the A4103, Leigh Sinton’. No reference is made to the adjacent heritage assets in the policy wording.</p> <p>On the basis of the above, the proposed allocation fails to accord with statutory duty as set out in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 section 66.</p> <p>Highway Matters -</p> <p>A large portion of the proposed allocated site lies on the bend of the A4103. Therefore, it is likely that any new vehicular access will need to be sited further north along the road close to the Leigh and Bransford Primary School.</p> <p>A major development of 52 dwellings along with any sport and</p>	
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>recreation facilities on 8.64ha of land is likely to generate significant movements to and from the site onto the A4103. This will inevitably lead to conflict with the school drop off and pick up times when vehicle movements are high.</p> <p>Paragraph 110 of the updated Framework states that <i>“In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that a...b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users...”</i>.</p> <p>Paragraph 111 follows outlining that <i>“Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe”</i>.</p> <p>The proposed allocation has not been fully assessed with regards to the potential impact upon highway/pedestrian safety along with the cumulative impacts upon the road network.</p> <p>Alternative Site –</p> <p>It is our contention that an alternative site should be allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>This site is referenced CFS0105 – ‘Land to the north edge of Leigh Sinton next to Upper House Farm’ as shown in the below image.</p> <p>This site has been subject to review as part of the SWDP and was deemed an appropriate site for residential development. However, the adjoining site (as proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan) was deemed more suitable. SIMON REES 6</p> <p>This proposed site did not raise any significant adverse impacts in terms of the Major Criteria applied by the South Worcestershire Planning Officers when assessing the sites suitability. The site is comparable in a number of areas to the proposed allocation.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, there are some clear differences.</p> <p>The site is smaller than the proposed allocation and would therefore have less of an impact upon the character and appearance of the village. The site would not encroach as much into the open</p>	
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>countryside and is more integrated with the existing village built form.</p> <p>There is one adjoining Grade II listed building called Upper House Farmhouse – Listed description - Early C19. Brick in Flemish bond with tile roof. Two storeys. Three bays. Windows are boxed sashes with glazing bars, with segmental heads on ground floor. Doorway, in middle bay, has timber Tuscan porch with triglyph frieze. Brick dentil course at eaves. Chimneys to left and right behind ridge.</p> <p>Whilst the site would have an impact upon the setting of the listed building. There is scope to design a scheme, which delivers open space and Green Infrastructure within its setting and thus reducing any impact from residential development.</p> <p>The site has three possible vehicular access points to the site as shown below.</p> <p>Two of the access points would be on to Sherridge Road, which is a much quieter road than the A4103. Therefore, the vehicular movements would not result in the same level of conflict as the proposed allocation next to the primary school.</p> <p>There are no constraints which would prevent this site coming forward. The site is deliverable now and would help to meet the identified housing needs of the village and will provide a high quality place to live.</p> <p>Conclusions –</p> <p>Drawing together the above, it is our contention that the proposed allocation in the draft Neighbourhood Plan will result in significant adverse impacts upon important heritage assets, highway/pedestrian safety and the surrounding highway network.</p> <p>The alternative site put forward above would not generate the significant impacts outlined above.</p> <p>It is our view that the Site Allocation Policy LB/H/5 - 'Land off the A4103, Leigh Sinton' be deleted and replaced with Land to the north edge of Leigh Sinton next to Upper House Farm.</p>	
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

<p>25. Mr S Rees AddisonRees Consultancy for Mr H Flight</p>	<p>O</p>	<p>The focus of this representation relates to the Neighbourhood Plan Policies: Housing: Leigh Sinton and Bransford Development Boundaries Policy LB/H/1.</p> <p>It is our contention that the development boundary for Leigh Sinton be enlarged to accommodate the site Ref. CFS0433.</p> <p>By accommodating this site within the defined development boundary, it will help to deliver a modest windfall supply of housing to the village. The site area is approximately 0.3ha and could accommodate up to 9 dwellings at 30 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>As part of the SHELAA Site assessment, this site along with Refs. CFS0105 and CFS0009 were the only three considered appropriate for residential development in the village.</p> <p>Site CFS0433 would be a continuation of development from an existing modern residential estate off Hop Pole Green. The site would successfully integrate with the built form and character of the village infilling a parcel of land, which already has residential development to the east and south east.</p> <p>The site can be accessed easily off an existing estate road and has good pedestrian and cycle access to local services and facilities within the village. The provision of a small scale housing scheme would not have an unacceptable impact upon highway safety or upon the surrounding road network. SIMON REES 2</p> <p>Paragraph 69 of the updated National Planning Policy Framework (2021) states that “Small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, and are often built-out relatively quickly. To promote the development of a good mix of sites local planning authorities should...c) support the development of windfall sites through their policies and decisions – giving great weight to the benefits of using suitable sites within existing settlements for homes...”.</p>	<p>The proposed revisions to the Development Area Boundary are consistent with the rationale in the SWDP Review. The proposed site for allocation exceeds the minimum requirement of the Indicative Housing Requirement.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>Paragraph 70 goes onto specifically highlight that “Neighbourhood planning groups should also give particular consideration to the opportunities for allocating small and medium-sized sites (of a size consistent with paragraph 69a) suitable for housing in their area”. Site Ref. CFS0433 falls perfectly within the above national policy guidance. This should carry significant weight in the assessment as to whether to enlarge the development boundary of Leigh Sinton to accommodate this site.</p> <p>There are no constraints affecting the delivery of housing on the site. Therefore, by accommodating the site within the development boundary, it will enable a deliverable supply of housing, which will include provision towards much needed affordable homes in the area.</p> <p>Conclusions – Drawing together the above, it is our contention that the defined development boundary for Leigh Sinton be redrawn to accommodate ‘Land at Hope Pole Green, Leigh Sinton, Worcestershire, WR13 5DP’ (Ref. CFS0433).</p>	
26. Mr P Boland: Historic England	S/O	<p>Historic England is extremely supportive of both the content of the document and the vision and objectives set out in it. Full and effective use has been made of the professional advice available through the Worcestershire Historic Environment Record (HER) and the Plan demonstrates a good understanding of the historic environment and provides a sound evidence base and good context for well thought out Plan policies. In this and most other respects Historic England considers that the Plan takes an exemplary approach to the historic environment.</p> <p>The recognition in the Plan of the importance of the local historic environment is highly commendable and Historic England strongly support that view. The emphasis on the conservation of local distinctiveness through good design and the protection of locally significant buildings and landscape character including archaeological remains, farm buildings, green spaces, biodiversity, strategic gaps between settlements and important views is to be applauded.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The impact on the four Grade II listed buildings has been recognized. Following further discussion with Historic England MHDC have concluded that an SEA is not required.</p>

		<p>We are, however, concerned to note that in relation to the site allocation proposed in the Plan the SHELAA Assessment reproduced at Appendix H states that there would be a detrimental impact on four grade II listed buildings opposite the site. The draft neighbourhood plan currently makes no direct reference to this fact and does not address how any adverse effects on designated heritage assets and their settings might be mitigated. We strongly suggest that this is considered further and discussed with Malvern Hills District Council with a view to ensuring that any proposed development avoids adverse effects on heritage assets or their settings and that this is reflected as appropriate in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	
27. MHDC Officers. See Appendix 3			
28. Mr A Larter, Mr P Larter, Ms J Larter, Ms E Larter (Separate Responses)	S	<p>Preserve the Significant Gap between Malvern and Leigh Sinton to allow Leigh Sinton to remain a village. The village has very little green space and what there is has been appreciated in times like Covid. PROTECT that green space.</p> <p>The village has had a lot of development over very recent years and limiting building to one site should be paramount. Having lived in the village for over two decades we know amenities are scarce to deal with a large influx of people. Preferred site of the A4103 would at least position a development on a different side of the village.</p> <p>New housing outside the development boundary only to be considered in very exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>New development designed keeping in mind the surrounding area, protecting local heritage and landscape, alongside maintaining biodiversity. Green policies to be adhered to with the protection of key views, amenities and well-being.</p>	Acknowledged
29. Ms M Lindsley: Coal Authority	C	<p>The information we hold does not indicate that there are any recorded coal mining features present at surface or shallow depth within the identified Neighbourhood Plan area. On this basis we have no specific comments to make on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	Acknowledged

30. Resident: Ms I Kite	S	<p>I agree that the significant gap between Malvern and Leigh Sinton should be retained, along with protection of existing local green space.</p> <p>I support the proposal that a large housing development should be limited to one designated site, within the existing Leigh Sinton Development boundary. The site specified in the Neighbourhood plan as land off the A4103 opposite Leigh and Bransford Primary School would provide the need for a number of dwellings and also open space for the community and I believe this should include a doctor's surgery for the Parish and facilities for the growing community of young teenagers in the area. This site would also introduce the requirement for a pedestrian crossing on the A4103, which would act as a traffic calming measure.</p> <p>I agree that new housing development in open countryside, outside the proposed development boundary should only be considered under exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Any new development should be appropriately designed, protect the local heritage and landscape, it should provide a net gain in biodiversity and follow appropriate policies for green infrastructure, the protection of key views is also essential.</p> <p>The village should remain a "dark sky" area.</p>	Acknowledged
31. Ms K Hughes Hereford and Worcester Earth and Heritage Trust	C	Details of local geology	Acknowledged
32. Ms E Barker and Ms N Friend Worcestershire CC		<p>We welcome the recognition, in the executive summary and in paragraph 2.1, of the Waste Core Strategy and saved policies of the Minerals Local Plan as part of the development plan, and welcome the confirmation in paragraph 2.1 that "<i>Waste and minerals are not addressed in the NP because they are County Council matters.</i>" The NP does, however, include two policies that address waste. These are</p>	Policies LB/D/3 and 4 have been discussed with WCC officers. Modified policies have been retained and changes made to and the Evidence and Justification.

	<p>considered to be unnecessary duplication in their current form. Whilst we welcome measures to limit waste and encourage re-use, we would recommend that the entirety of policy <i>LB/D/3: Design: Construction Waste and Recycling</i> and its supporting paragraph 5.2.7 are deleted. Alternatively, we would support the first sentence of policy <i>LB/D/3</i> being retained (as this aspect is not covered to the same extent in the Waste Core Strategy or emerging Minerals Local Plan), with the first two sentences of 5.2.7 – which are verbatim extracts from the Waste Core Strategy - being deleted. NP policy <i>LB/D/4 Household Waste and Recycling</i> is already covered by Waste Core Strategy policy <i>WCS 17: Making provision for waste in all new development</i>. As such, we recommend the deletion of policy <i>LB/D/4</i> and paragraph 5.2.8.</p> <p>To further clarify our respective roles, we recommend a minor addition to paragraph 2.1 as shown in in the following bold underlined text: <i>“When the NP has been adopted as part of the Development Plan it will form the basis for determining planning applications in the area. There are some issues, including transport, development for education, and minerals and waste, for which Worcestershire County Council is the lead authority.”</i></p> <p>We note that the only site allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan is a site that has been progressed through the South Worcestershire Development Plan process. As such, we do not have any comments to make in relation to the safeguarding of waste or minerals sites, or minerals resources or infrastructure, from development proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Historic Environment</p> <p>Heritage and landscape forms an integral part of the draft Leigh and Bransford Neighbourhood Plan reflecting good understanding of how both contribute to local character and distinctiveness as well as the opportunities they present for future place shaping. However, we do have concerns regarding the wording of some heritage and landscape policies which require additional clarification of the expectations set</p>	<p>The original Heritage and Landscape sections of the LBNP were drafted after</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>out so that they better reflect the local distinctiveness of the parish. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss how this could be achieved through the Plan with the NDP Team. Please contact Emily Hathaway (Historic Environment Advisor) Worcestershire Archive and Archaeology Service on Tel: 01905 844874 who would be happy to discuss this further with you.</p> <p>Transport Policy Teams</p> <p>From a highways perspective we would ask that the Neighbourhood Plan take account of or make reference to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development should adhere guidelines set out in the Worcestershire Streetscape Design Guide • All new community facilities should be accessible by walking / cycling and have pedestrian links from key residential areas. • All new employment sites should include cycle parking (see Worcestershire Streetscape Design Guide for details) 	<p>discussion with WCC HER team. Policies have been amended to an agreed wording.</p> <p>All these elements have been noted and the LBNP made consistent. Amendments agreed with WCC.</p>
33. Mr M Verlander (Avison Young) on behalf of National Grid Electricity Transmission and National Grid Gas	C	<p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission assets which include high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines. National Grid has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p>	Acknowledged
34. Residents: Mr S Brown and Mrs S Brown (separate responses)	S	<p>We support the Leigh and Bransford Neighbourhood Plan and in particular agree with the following points: Only under exceptional circumstances should new housing development in open countryside outside the proposed development boundary be considered.</p>	Acknowledged

		<p>The Significant Gap between Leigh Sinton and Malvern should be retained along with the protection of existing Local Green Space. Large housing development should be limited to one designated site within the existing Leigh Sinton Development Boundary. Half the development should be allocated to 52 dwellings (to include affordable housing) and half as open space. A pedestrian crossing on the A4103 would act as a traffic calming measure and ensure safe crossing for the primary school.</p> <p>Any new development should be appropriately designed, protect the local landscape, provide a net gain in biodiversity (bat boxes, swift boxes, wildlife corridors etc) It should follow the appropriate policies for Green Infrastructure, the protection of key views and amenities.</p>	
35. Residents: Mr D and Mrs A Hall	S	<p>We are against any development within the Significant Gap. It is the role of the L and B Neighbourhood Plan to protect the Significant Gap from any future development.</p> <p>Malvern Rd floods frequently and is unpassable when flooded. Surface run off from developments in the adjacent fields will only increase the risk and frequency of flooding.</p> <p>Two new large developments (Cala and Bromford) recently completed impact on village roads, safety, etc. Unknown fully but negative impacts already seen.</p> <p>Village already has large disproportionate housing on one side of main road. Opposite the Primary School is a much safer, clearer option.</p>	Acknowledged
36 Resident: Ms S Brazier	S	<p>We have had so much housing and we want to make sure the gap between Malvern and Leigh Sinton is respected. Any further developments should be appropriate for Leigh Sinton. Traffic through Leigh Sinton needs some form of calming as the speed has been increasing.</p>	Acknowledged
37. Resident: Mr R Darby	O	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Executive Summary The area for Leigh Sinton in the NP does not collate with the area proposed on the SWDP 2. It seems the councils are really up for destroying the English 	The LBNP seeks to have regard to the NPPF, and be in general conformity with the

		<p>Villages and trying to turn them into Towns</p> <p>3. Surely the housing development in Bluebell Way and the CALA Development meets SW quota</p> <p>4. The NP does not meet the criteria of the NPPF 2021</p> <p>5. Introduction 1.3 : NPPF 2021 has not been adhered to</p> <p>6. Introduction 1.8 The NP does not meet the criteria of the NPPF 2021</p> <p>7. Introduction 1.10 It is evident that the writer has not visited the proposed site in relation to heritage, biodiversity, landscape and design</p> <p>8. General Background To Parish There is very little employment, amenities and public transport in Leigh Sinton so therefore by building houses there is going to be an increase in commuting traffic which is not needed.</p> <p>9. General Background To Parish 3.17 All valid points, but NONE have been considered in the NP proposal</p> <p>10. LB/H/1 Policy not in line with SWDP</p> <p>11. LB/H/1 Map 2 and Map 4a do not collate</p> <p>12. LB/H/5 5.1.11 30% increase in housing since 2017 and Councils still want to build more</p> <p>13. LB/H/5 5.1.15 Proposed site is NOT acceptable to the community</p> <p>14. LB/H/5 5.1.15 Indicative Housing Requirement will probably fall away due to the Government rethink. Therefore, the time and money wasted on this document, which should be put on hold, is not acceptable to tax payers.</p> <p>15. LB/H/5 5.1.17 It is clear that local drainage issues have not been taken into account</p> <p>16. LB/H/55.1.18 How many members of the Leigh and Bransford Badgers Football Club actually live in the Leigh Sinton?</p> <p>17. LB/H/5 5.1.19 It is stated that about 16% of Leigh Sinton are under the age of 20 therefore the reasoning for 5.1.18 is invalid</p> <p>18 LB/H/5 5.1.20 Why is there an insistence by the Council that the village has to grow?</p>	<p>SWDP.</p> <p>A strategic housing allocation has been made for Leigh Sinton. A Neighbourhood Plan cannot seek to reduce that allocation.</p> <p>1. The Neighbourhood area is the administrative boundary of the combined parishes of Leigh and Bransford. This boundary is not included in the SWDP 24. Heritage issues have been addressed by Historic England and MHDC. A full Strategic Environmental Assessment was not deemed to be required.</p> <p>Flooding: Zone 1 refers to fluvial flooding. Any flooding on the proposed site for allocation are pluvial. Drainage policies cover these issues.</p> <p>All other comments have been noted.</p>
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>19 LB/H/5 5.1.22 The revised SWDP is not out of date</p> <p>20. LB/D/2 5.2.3 And the Council wants to increase the vehicle numbers by building another 52 houses. Where is the rationale?</p> <p>21. As 20</p> <p>22. LB/D/2 5.2.5 Agreed. So no development to take place!!!</p> <p>23. LB/HLB/5 5.30 There is no up to date Heritage/Archaeology Report for the area around Little Moat Nash Green. Until this is presented then there is no way forward LB/HLB/8</p> <p>24 5.3.15 I have not seen a up to date Ecological Detail Survey for the area around Little Moat Nash Green. Until this is presented then there is no way forward</p> <p>25. LB/IFD/1 5.50 Flooding - What is happening with regards to the yearly flooding of the fields in the proposed Development Boundary</p> <p>26. LB/IC/2 5.5.9 It begs belief that the mobile signals in Leigh Sinton are virtually none existent In this day of technology</p> <p>27. Appendix H 3.00 Land floods every year. Definitely not a Flood zone 1</p> <p>28. Appendix H 5.00 Due to speeding issues, school and volume of traffic. Site will not have a safe access</p> <p>29. Appendix H 6.00 Has hydraulic modelling been done by Severn Trent? When will the effect of the proposed housing be on the water pressure and what is been done to the sewage issues within the village</p> <p>30. Appendix H 17.00 No up-to-date Ecological Survey results have been published. Evidence of bats, newts, skylarks and other protected species have been noted by residents</p> <p>31. Appendix H 22.00 Needs to be assessed during periods of heavy rainfall and solution needs to be published.</p> <p>32. Appendix H 23.00 Contaminated Land to be investigated and results published</p>	
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

38. Resident: Mr T Reader	O	<p>Housing: Site Allocation: Evidence and Justification. Policy LB/H/5: The destruction of such highly productive farm land is exactly what current and future government thinking is going to stop. Local food production must be paramount, our world class farmers cannot be deprived of this asset. This country must strive to be as self-sufficient as possible especially given the pollution caused by needless transportation, loss of agricultural employment opportunities and import taxes. New services infrastructure and access to the A4103 will need to be created, and access to all the existing village amenities will entail crossing this very busy and dangerous highway. Current seasonal flooding makes the area unsuitable for residential or sports facilities and overflow drainage from the Moat pond, protecting Nash Green from flooding, is routed through the field. The rural village of Leigh Sinton does not need more housing when brownfield sites are available in current built up areas, complete with services and job opportunities close by</p>	Acknowledged
39. Jack Casey Lone Star Land on behalf of Mr W Beard	O	<p>Paragraph 3.11 Transport and Moving Around</p> <p>This paragraph sets out some of the issues currently experienced with transport within the Parish. These are typical of rural areas. Paragraph 105 of the NPPF notes that; "...opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision making.</p> <p>Given the concerns set out in this paragraph, it is surprising that there is no reference to the Active Travel Route proposed between Leigh Sinton and Malvern by the Worcestershire Local Transport Plan - LTP4. https://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/downloads/file/9024/worcestershire_local_transport_plan_4_2018-2030_-_adopted_2017</p>	Ref to LTP4 noted. Text updated

		<p>It should also be noted that reliance on private transport is becoming less unsustainable due to the introduction of electric vehicles. These vehicles, (both cars and bicycles) are gaining popularity and CO2 emitting vehicles will be phased-out by Government legislation.</p> <p>See Appendix 1 – Worcestershire Local Transport Plan 4 (2018 – 2030) – Adopted 2017</p>	Noted
		<p>LB/H/4 - While we question whether there is a need at all for a Significant Gap between Malvern and Leigh Sinton, it is the case that one exists in the current SWDP. However, it is our view that the Neighbourhood Plan should review the detailed boundary of the Significant Gap to ensure that any land included within this policy designation is needed to achieve the purposes of the policy.</p> <p>The South Worcestershire Authorities have commissioned an Appraisal of the Significant Gaps as part of its evidence based for the SWDP Review. As noted by the SWDP Significant Gaps Appraisal, there is no policy support for a significant gaps policy in the NPPF. It is, however, a commonly held planning principle that individual settlements should remain separate. The 'SWDP Review Significant Gaps Appraisal' notes that the policy is more restrictive than Green Belt policy, which allows for various types of appropriate development which can reduce openness to a degree. Therefore, it is very important that only land required to fulfil the purpose of the Significant Gap policy should be covered by it.</p> <p>The SWDP Significant Gaps Appraisal poses a series of questions. One is - “Is the extent of the SG necessary? Could physical openness and visual openness be maintained/achieved with a reduced gap? In the case of Leigh Sinton, the Significant Gaps Appraisal states; “Retain with the possible exception of a few discrete land parcels on the edge of Leigh Sinton should they be needed i.e. allocations in either the SWDPR or Leigh Sinton Neighbourhood Plan.” It is our contention that much of the land to the south of Leigh Sinton does not need to be protected as both the physical and visual separation can be maintained with a reduced gap. This point is</p>	<p>Whilst the SWDP Review Significant Gaps Appraisal is not mentioned in the current text it was taken into account. We note the Significant Gap between Leigh Sinton and Malvern was not changed in the review.</p>

		<p>underlined by the shape of the southern edge of the built up boundary to the village - there are a number of fields that could be developed that would, as a matter of fact, not bring the village closer to Malvern. This is demonstrated by the Incola Significant Gap report submitted with these representations.</p> <p>It cannot be correct that land is retained in a Significant Gap when the land is not needed to achieve the purposes of the Significant Gap policy given the very restrictive nature of this policy. The only relevant consideration in determining which land should be covered by the Significant Gaps policy is whether or not it is necessary to maintain a clear separation between the smaller settlement and the urban area.</p> <p>As the SWDPR Significant Gaps Appraisal notes, there is no reference to this type of policy in the NPPF. The only similar policies relates to the Green Belt. Given that is it analogous to Green Belt policy, it is worth considering the advice in paragraph 140 of the NPPF. This states that, if it is necessary to restrict development primarily because of the importance of the open character of a village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, it should be included within the Green Belt. However, if the area needs to be protected for other reasons, other means should be used such as normal development management policies. A similar principle should apply to the Significant Gaps policy, due to its highly restrictive nature and specific planning purpose. If land is genuinely required to maintain a clear separation between the settlements, then it should be protected by the Significant Gaps policy. If it is not, then is should be protected by normal development management policies that protect the countryside.</p> <p>It is clear that our clients land off Leigh Sinton Road, (SHLAA site CFS0640) which has been promoted to this plan and the SWDP Review for development and community facilities, is not needed to maintain the Significant Gap between Leigh Sinton and Malvern. This is not only the conclusion of the Incola report but it is also the conclusion of the consultants appointed by SWCs to appraise the Significant Gaps for the SWDP Review. It is noted that the SWDP Review Significant Gaps Appraisal does not form part of the evidence base for the Neighbourhood Plan. This is a serious omission.</p>	
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>Documents submitted with response to LB/H/3 Appendix 2 - SWDP Review - Significant Gaps Appraisal Appendix 3 - Incola - Significant Gap Review</p>	
		<p>LB/H/5 - We object to the allocation of this site as the site appraisal is flawed. While the site is in the draft SWDP, there are objections and this draft allocation has not been subject to independent examination. Therefore, little weight can be given to that factor. In term of the detailed site assessment, it is flawed for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leigh Sinton is not a Category 3 village but a Category 2 village in the SWDP. Objections have been made to the downgrading of the village Category 3 in the SWDP Review. • Safe access on to public highways. No highways assessment has been provided or referred to in the evidence base. A Technical note produced by MEC for LSL is submitted with these representations which questions whether this site can achieve a suitable access. There is reference to the need for a signalised junction. This would disrupt traffic along this arterial route as well as cause harm to the setting of the listed buildings opposite the site. • It is stated that the allocated site is compatible with 'residential amenity'. Whilst the proximity to nearby facilities is good, the proposed allocation is separated from these amenities by the A4103 which acts as a considerable barrier to sustainable movement. The development proposals will introduce additional vulnerable road users to the A4103 most noticeably primary school children accessing Leigh and Bransford Primary School. See MEC technical note for additional information. The NDP assessment also comments in the summary that there are 'Possible access issues' yet continues to allocate the site without assessing whether this site can be accessed safely. • The NDP's own assessment identifies that the site will have a detrimental impact on heritage and archaeology. The site forms the 	<p>LS was classified as a Cat3 village in the 2019 Village Facilities and Rural Transport Study. We understand from MHDC the VFRTS is an independent document.</p> <p>WCC Highways have been consulted on highway matters.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The SEA Screening Opinion</p>

		<p>setting of Grade II listed buildings. There is no heritage assessment in the evidence base as to the degree of harm that would be caused to the setting of these designated heritage assets. As noted above, the traffic lights needed for the junction will worsen the harm to the setting of the heritage assets. In addition, there is reference to a Moat nearby with the potential for archaeology. Again there is no assessment on what harm development would have on this heritage asset.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been no consideration of the landscape impact of the development, particularly given the significant impact that will inevitably result to users of PROW 582(c) which bisects this site. • The site allocation has not taken into consideration the key views from PROW 582(c) if following criteria from the key view assessment (Appendix E) there would be high level of key views from several points along the route. <p>Documents submitted with response to LB/H/5 Appendix 4 - MEC Technical Note</p>	<p>has confirmed that a full SEA is not required. Historic England has agreed.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal September 2019 of the SWDPR B14.4.2 Views from PROW concluded that there would be 'a minor negative impact.'</p>
		<p>Para 5.1.18 - This paragraph states that one reason for SWC's choice of preferred site was that it provided the opportunity for community facilities. However, Leigh Sinton Farm site (SHLAA site CSF0640) also offers the opportunity for community facilities at a site that has a much less landscape impact, is not within the setting of any heritage assets, and has a proven safe access, with the acceptance of a haul road in this location.</p>	Noted
		<p>Para 5.1.22 - This paragraph notes that the NPPF affords some protection to Neighbourhood Areas where the neighbourhood plan contains policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirements. The protections offered in paragraph 14 of the NPPF only apply to neighbourhood plans that are less than 2 years old.</p>	Noted
		<p>It should be noted that the housing supply in the SWDP Review relies some very large urban extensions and 2 new settlements. Developments at this</p>	Noted. The proposed allocation covers the current

		<p>scale are difficult to deliver in line with the trajectories envisaged when they are conceived. The SWDP review plan also proposes to manage the housing supply situation on a SWDP wide basis: so for example, under-delivery at the Throckmorton New Settlement in Wychavon could be made up for within Malvern Hills.</p> <p>We are aware of a number of neighbourhood plans that have sort to maintain control of where further housing goes should the wider District fall into position of not being able demonstrate a five supply of housing land. This is prudent and allows for some control over where any further housing if required whether the 'tilted balance' is engaged because of out-of-date housing policies . Therefore, we consider that the NDP should to identify a reserve housing site for this eventuality. Examples of where reserve housing sites have been included in Neighbourhood plans can be found within the made neighbourhood plans of Wellesbourne and Shipton on Stour in Stratford-on-Avon District.</p>	<p>indicative housing figure.</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Map 2: Map does not show consented and built development on A4103 by Bromford Homes therefore incorrect Development Boundary. (Map is out of date) • Map 3: Doesn't show the Bromford development site which should not be included in the significant gap (Map is out of date) • Map 3a: (as above) Doesn't show the Bromford development site which should not be included in the significant gap (Map is out of date) • Map 4: does not include the consented and built out Bromford site within the Existing Development Area (Map is out of date) 	<p>Development Boundary Map altered but Significant Gap Map will be amended in SWDP-R</p>

		<p>LB/D/2 - It states that all developments will comply with Worcestershire County Councils Streetscape Design Guide 2020. This document has not been independently examined and despite numerous valid objections on the grounds of place-making and design, the document was adopted as supplementary guidance by Worcestershire County Council. This guidance will have a particularly negative impact on design. This is because the Streetscape Design Guide does not count garages as parking spaces even if oversized garages are provided. This conflicts with National Policy. The examiner of the Eckington NDP (Wychavon) advised that modifications to that NDP needed to be made in order to comply with national policy, and meet the basic conditions. She stated 'To not count garages as car parking spaces would be likely to result in widespread parking areas possibly to the detriment of well planned and designed places. Although the County Council's Streetscape Design Guide (2018) indicates garages are not included in any calculation as they are often converted or used for storage, little local justification for this element is put forward. ' Ann Skippers October 2019.</p> <p>Since that time, and since the publication of the Streetscape Design Guide, the NPPF has been revised and National design guidance issued which have strengthened design policies. Reference to the Streetscape Design Guide should be deleted from this policy as it does not comply with national policy</p>	<p>The policy has been discussed and agreed with WCC</p>
		<p>Para 5.2.5 - This paragraph sets out some the issues currently experienced with transport within the Parish. These are typical of rural areas. Paragraph 105 of the NPPF notes that; "...opportunities to maximise suitable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision making.</p> <p>Given the concern set out in this paragraph, it is surprising that there is no reference to the Active Travel Route proposed between Leigh Sinton and Malvern by the Worcestershire Local Transport Plan - LTP4.</p> <p>It should also be noted that reliance on private transport is becoming less unsustainable due to the introduction of electric vehicles. These vehicles, (both cars and cycles) are gaining popularity and CO2 emitting vehicles which will be phased out by Government legislation. Indeed policy LB/IRLCE/3</p>	<p>Reference to ATR's in the LTP is included in the Reg 15 LBNP.</p>

		<p>proposes that each new dwelling where parking is provided will require an electric vehicle charging point. Although this does not mean that everyone who purchases a property will necessarily have an electric vehicle, yet encourages households to do so making the use of travel by car more sustainable and eco-friendly. In time everyone will have an electric vehicle.</p> <p>The conclusion that significant development will not be sustainable in terms of transport will not be valid in the near future.</p>	
		<p>LB/HLB/2 - Our client owns the proposed local green space at the Orchard adjacent to Kiln Lane. This allocation is supported.</p>	Noted
		<p>LB/HLB/3 - While there is no objection to the key views identified, it is our view that, using the criteria in Appendix E there are other key views that should be set out in this plan.</p> <p>One difficulty is that the NDP refers to a document produced by Environmental, Landscape and Colour Consultancy but this has not been made publicly available therefore we are not able to examine how these views have been assessed. This document needs to be in the evidence base and made publicly available. For example, within the “very high’ visual value criteria is one which states “Views in which receptors have a proprietary interest, including people living within residential properties.” This is clearly an unacceptable criterion. The planning system does not protect private interests in this way; it can only protect a view in the public interest. Someone may have bought a house with a view but they did not buy rights across the land over which they have the view. Such a private view cannot be protected by the planning system. Without reviewing the ELC consultancy report, it is not clear whether this ultra vires consideration has played a part in the definition of the Key Views.</p> <p>There are views of the Malvern Hills and towards listed buildings from PROW 582C. When looking at Appendix E: Potential criteria for Assessing</p>	Noted. Views of heritage assets from PROW were considered

		<p>the Visual Value of Views, a key view has not been identified. Views of the Malverns appear to be a key criteria for a Valued View. Views from within or toward Grade II listed buildings are considered to be a High Level of Visual Value. Therefore, there should be additional key views added from the PROW 582(c) looking towards the Malverns and the Grade II listed buildings on the A4103. Clearly this will have significant negative implications for the allocated housing site.</p> <p>Appendix 5 – Potential Key Views Appendix 6-8 – Photographs of Key Views taken from PROW 582(c)</p>	
		<p>LB/IMA/4 - This policy is supported however there has been no reference made to the Worcestershire's Local Transport Plan 4 proposal for an active travel corridor. - see LTP4 - South Worcestershire - SWAT9 the Malvern to Leigh Sinton Active Travel Corridor. This scheme will help make the services within Malvern accessible for the residents of Leigh Sinton without the need of a car. It will be suitable for electric bicycles and as normal bicycles and walking, thereby helping to solve many of the problems identified throughout the Plan regarding access to services and facilities. This will dramatically improve the sustainability of this settlement when constructed.</p> <p>Appendix 1 – Worcestershire's LTP</p>	Reference to SWAT 9 from LTP4 now included
		<p>Appendix H - The assessment of SHLAA site CFS0640 is flawed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leigh Sinton is not a Category 3 village but a Category 2 village in the SWDP. there are objections to the downgrading of the village. It has not yet been reviewed by an examiner therefore cannot be attributed any weight. The NDP should consider the settlement as Category 2, which it is currently. Possibly medieval potential, this is untrue. Please see the Historic Environmental Desk-Based Assessment completed by Cotswold Archaeology. This report concluded that there is a low potential for 	Each point noted.

		<p>currently unrecorded archaeological remains within the site and that development on this site would result in no harm to the significance of any designated heritage assets through alteration of their setting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Regard to the impact on the Grade II listed (former manse) the impact on this heritage asset has been assessed in the Historic Environmental Desk-Based Assessment completed by Cotswold Archaeology and it was concluded that although it is within close proximity to the site, this area has no intervisibility due to the existent built form. (See report for evidence). This contrast markedly with the assessment of the allocated site in this regard. • The site would retain the TPO trees that are outside of the potential development area. • It is mentioned that the site will have a detrimental impact on the significant gap. There is no evidence to support this statement. The detailed policy assessing the significant gap has not been looked at in enough detail to consider its placement and how each area affects the purpose of the policy. • It is noted that this site would not assist in supporting or delivering identified community infrastructure needs. We promoted this site for development of housing as well as the provision of sports pitches. • Access to the site. Planning permission was granted for a haul road for the Cala Homes development. This indicated that there is a safe and usable access to the site. <p>Documents submitted with representations to Appendix H</p> <p>Appendix Original Proposals (including sports pitches)</p> <p>Appendix 10 - Cotswold Archaeology - Historic Environmental Assessment</p> <p>Appendix 3 - Incola - Significant Gap Assessment</p>	
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

<p>40. Mr P Smith, Pegasus Group on behalf of clients</p>	<p>O</p>	<p>LB/H/1 - This representation is submitted on behalf of our clients who have a land interest at Leigh Sinton at site CFS1084. The Leigh Sinton Development Boundary should be extended to include site CFS1084. (see our representation to Policy LB/H/5: Housing: Site Allocation).</p>	<p>The boundary has recently been reviewed as part of the SWDP Review and by Parish Council</p>
		<p>LB/H/2 - For information, our clients have raised an objection to the re-categorisation of Leigh Sinton in the SWDPR from a Category 2 Village to a Category 3 Village, and to the evidence base which site behind the re-categorisation.</p>	<p>Noted. LS was classified as a Cat3 village in the 2019 Village Facilities and Rural Transport Study. Ref to SWDP removed.</p>
		<p>LB/H/4 - 1. The ‘Significant Gap’ is a policy designation which in this instance seeks to secure separation between the north of Malvern and Leigh Sinton. 2. Our clients’ site at Leigh Sinton is currently situated within the Significant Gap which was established in the adopted SWDP (2016) under Policy 2D. Paragraph 8 of the reasoned justification states that; “The purpose of maintaining these gaps, which either serve as a buffer or visual break between rural settlements and adjacent urban areas or protect the character and setting of settlements, is to provide additional protection to open land that may be subject to development pressures. The designation helps to maintain a clear separation between smaller settlements and urban areas in order to retain their individual identity.” (emphasis added) 3. The Landscape and Visual Impact Report prepared by Pegasus, attached at Appendix 2 clearly demonstrates at paragraphs 1.23 – 1.25 that bringing our clients’ site forward for development will not have an impact on the existing visual break and separation between Malvern and Leigh Sinton. 4. Appendix 3 shows the modification to the Significant Gap at Leigh Sinton that was undertaken during the preparation of the SWDP to allow a housing allocation to come forward at the village (SWDP60d - Land at Kiln Lane). This resulted in an incursion into the Significant Gap on the southern edge of the village that extends almost as far south as the southern most part of our clients’ site (which would likely be required to provide surface water attenuation and therefore would be likely to remain undeveloped). 5. The</p>	<p>Agree Significant Gap policy is in current SWDP and reviewed in the SWDP-R, which recommends no change to the Leigh Sinton-Malvern SG. The policy was also reviewed by Parish Council and agreed</p>

		<p>development of our clients' site would therefore not affect the policy intent of the Significant Gap. A significant buffer and visual separation between Leigh Sinton and the north of Malvern would be maintained, as well as clear separation between the two settlements, with development spreading no further south along Leigh Sinton Road towards Malvern than currently already exists. 6. The Significant Boundary as shown on Maps 3 and 3a should be amended to exclude site CFS1084. 7. Failing that, a criteria-based policy should be developed so that development can come forward within the Significant Gap where it can be demonstrated that openness and separation would not be affected by the development</p>	
		<p>LB/H/5 - allocates site CFS0009, Land off the A4103, Leigh Sinton for 2.87Ha for residential use for approximately 52 dwellings and approximately 2.82Ha potentially for sports and recreation use. The site selection was largely based on the South Worcestershire Councils (SWC) preferred site in the draft SWDP. The Neighbourhood Plan states at paragraph 5.1.17: 'The site assessment was reviewed by Leigh and Bransford Parish Council with an added (a) number of specific criteria including, linearity, local drainage issues, wildlife corridors, and community facilities. It was determined that the most suitable site was the site proposed by SWC'. 2. Furthermore paragraph 5.1.18 states that one reason for SWC's choice of preferred site was that it provided the opportunity for community facilities, although these are as yet unspecified. 3. There are fundamental flaws with this approach. First, reliance on the SWC site selection is unjustified for reasons set out below, and secondly, the additional Parish Council criteria appear only to have been assessed for site CFS0009 (Appendix H), and not for any reasonable alternatives. 4. The Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) (Dec 2019) prepared to support the SWDP Review lists our clients' site as CFS1084 (Land adjoining Malvern Road), however no entries are provided in the SHELAA table against our clients' site. This Table is reproduced at Appendix H in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. The omission of entries in the Table relating to site CFS1084 results in</p>	<p>All points noted. App H reproduced the original SWC appraisal document. Site CFS1084 was added later and was equally considered.</p>

		<p>a lack of transparency in the selection of the allocated site within the current Regulation 14 consultation. 5. It is considered therefore that our clients' site, which is well located within the existing form of the village, has been prejudiced due to not being thoroughly considered through the SHLEAA process. 6. However, The Sustainability Appraisal (Lepus Consulting - Sept 2019) produced alongside preferred options draft SWDP does consider site CFS1084. 7. Our clients made the following representations with regard to the consideration site CFS1084 in the Sustainability Appraisal as part of the SWDP Regulation 18 Consultation in December 2019. Those comments were supported by additional evidence commissioned by our clients, including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Pegasus Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVIA) (Appendix 2)• Calibro Surface Water Flood Risk Assessment Technical Note (Appendix 3)• Pegasus Heritage Note (Appendix 4) Cont. <p>SA Objective 2 – Climate Change Adaptation 8. The SWDP SA scores site CFS1084 as 'minor positive' with regard to fluvial flooding as the site is situated within Flood zone 1, however it scores the site 'major negative' with regard to pluvial flood risk. Overall the site scores a major negative. The Calibro Surface Water Flood Risk Assessment (Dec 2019) (FRA) challenges the findings of the SA with regard to flood risk as the EA modelling on which it is based does not adequately plot or account for the existing on-site drainage feature, namely a large drainage ditch which runs across the centre of the site.</p> <p>9. The evidence presented at Appendix 3 provides analysis which draws on topographical survey, site observations, anecdotal information and hydrological and hydraulic analysis. Appendix 3 demonstrates that development at the site can provide adequate surface water mitigation such that residents would not be subject to surface water flood risk and, importantly, off site surface water flood risk can also be mitigated such that surface water flooding that currently occurs along Malvern Road can also be addressed by changing levels at the access to the site and installing drainage within the highway which would discharge to the on-site ditch. 10. To</p>	
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>summarise development at the site could take place in accordance with planning policy which would not place end users at high risk of pluvial flooding nor would it increase flooding elsewhere, it could provide mitigation and improve the surface water flood risk which currently affects local residents. Development of the site provides the opportunity to significantly reduce flood risk on the junctions of Leigh Sinton Road/Chapel Close. SA Objective 4 – Landscape and Townscape 11. The SWDP SA states that development of the site, ‘could potentially be discordant with the guidelines and characteristics of ‘Principal Timbered Farmlands’ LCTand therefore, a minor negative impact on the local landscape character.’</p> <p>12. The Pegasus Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVIA) attached at Appendix 2 challenges the findings of the SA stating at paragraph 1.32 that; “The site provides an opportunity for development which fits within the existing small-scale village setting. Development of the larger CFS0009 allocation would provide a large-scale development which would be at odds with the more organic evolution of the village settlement.”</p> <p>13. The SA also states that several Public Rights of Ways (PROWS) are located in close proximity to the Leigh Sinton cluster and that development at CFS1084 ‘could potentially alter the views experienced by users of these footpaths’. Appendix 2 confirms at paragraph 1.34 that CFS1084 has no PROW in close proximity and that the short extent of the site is limited and benefits from mature hedgerow planting along its western boundary with the settlement edge.</p> <p>14. The LVIA states at paragraph 1.41 that; “The site benefits from good physical and visual containment to the north and west due to the existing residential area at Leigh Sinton. Leigh Sinton Road and Lower Howsell Road provide strong physical boundaries to the west and south respectively. The boundary hedgerows along the edges of Leigh Sinton Road and Lower Howsell Road would benefit from enhancement to bolster screening of built form when viewed from the settlement edge Leigh Sinton.”</p> <p>15. Moreover, “strong landscape framework wrapping around the south, western and eastern sides of</p>	
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>the site to provide substantial physical and visual containment in the medium and longer term. Enhanced boundary planting and landscaping would have the effect of rounding off the Leigh Sinton development to the west.” The report concludes “Overall, in landscape and visual terms, the site is considered suitable for residential development”. Cont.</p> <p>16. The LVIA compares the development potential of site CFS1084 with the allocated site CFS0009 which would provide for 52 dwellings to the northeast of the village. Appendix 2 states of the allocation; “Development of the larger CFS0009 allocation would provide a large-scale development which would be at odds with the more organic evolution of the village settlement.” “The two fields comprising site CFS0009 are large and flat, its boundary hedgerow low and very open along its roadside boundary and with clear views across CFS0009 (Context View 12). Views are also available within CFS0009 from PRow footpath 582.” “Development of CFS0009 would be viewed from the A4103 as a vast extension of Leigh Sinton experienced upon arrival and when departing the village.” 17. Crucially, and notwithstanding the broad-brush findings of the SA, Appendix 2 describes at paragraphs 1.30 and 1.31 the landscape evidence base that sits behind the development of the SWDPR, the ‘Malvern Hills AONB Study’ (May 2019), and the fact that site CFS1084 falls within LCP M13 and is assessed as having medium visual sensitivity and capacity for 1ha-5ha of housing, the site being 1.62ha. 18. In contrast, site CFS0009 is situated within sits within M11. For 5ha-10ha the study assessed this area as being high/medium sensitivity with no capacity for housing. “The study concludes that there are opportunities for development at “Leigh Sinton- ... the southern part of M11 (up to 5Ha) and the western part of M13 (1Ha).” The site falls at the western edge of the parcel and is therefore conducive with the findings of the report. Proposed draft allocation CFS0009 is larger than the recommended growth capacity and would be much more visible from the AONB (as illustrated at Photo View A within the</p>	
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>report) and would be viewed as sprawl beyond the village limits. In contrast the site (CFS1084) would be viewed against the backdrop of Leigh Sinton.” (LVIA para. 1.31) SA Objective 5 – Pollution and Waste 19. It is considered that there would be negligible impact from the development of up to 30 dwellings at the site in terms of air pollution. SA Objective 6 – Natural Resources 20. The site has been used for grazing for many years and is not used for arable or crop production purposes. SA Objective 9 – Cultural Heritage 21. The SA scores CFS1084 as minor negative owing to impact on the setting of Listed Buildings. The Pegasus Heritage Note attached at Appendix 4 thoroughly assesses both the location of listed buildings in close proximity to our clients’ site and the potential for development at the site to impact on their setting. 22. Further to in depth analysis following a site visit, the conclusions of the summary note states: Cont. “47. In summary, the Site is considered to make a negligible contribution to the heritage significance of the Grade II Listed Meadow View, Ahisma Malvern House Cottage, and the Grade II Listed Sinton House Farmhouse through setting. 48. The Site is considered to make no contribution to the heritage significance of the Grade II Listed Oast House through setting. 49. Overall, there are no overriding heritage constraints to the deliverability of the Site.” 23. It is therefore considered that Site CFS1084 should not score ‘minor negative’ with regard to cultural heritage but should score ‘0’. SA Objective 10 -Transport and Connectivity 24. The SA states that site CFS1084 currently has poor access to the surrounding footpath network, however development of the site would result in the provision of highway pavement connectivity linking in to exiting pavements in the village. This is especially critical as it would allow children from the site to walk to the primary school without having to cross the heavily trafficked A4103 as is the case with allocated site CFS0009. SA Objective 11 – Education 25. The SA states that CFS1084 would score a minor positive with regard to proximity to the primary</p>	
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>school but minor negative with regard to proximity to a secondary school. This should not result in a minor negative score but a '0' score as the minor positive balances the minor negative with regard to this matter. SA Objective 12 – Economy 26. The SA states with regard to Leigh Sinton; “B.14.12.1 Primary Employment Location: There are a number of key employment locations within the target distance of the Leigh Sinton cluster, including Guinness Park Farm located approximately 1.5km from the cluster. The proposed development at all seven sites would therefore be expected to locate site end users in areas with good access to employment opportunities and have a minor positive impact on the local economy.” Conclusions • The SWDPR ‘Malvern Hills AONB Study’ (May 2019) identifies Site CFS1084 as being of an appropriate size and within an appropriate location for development at Leigh Sinton. (see Appendix 2). • The allocated site (CFS009) at Leigh Sinton is not located in an appropriate location for development in accordance with the ‘Malvern Hills AONB Study’ (May 2019) (see Appendix 2). • Development of the Site CFS1084 would be read against the existing built form of the village (see Appendix 2). • Development of Site CFS1084 can bring forward mitigation to existing surface water flood issues and the site can be developed without putting residents at risk of surface water flooding, either on or off the site (see Appendix 3) • The EA mapping used by the SA is high level and not based on a topographical survey of Site CFS1084 (see Appendix 3) • The EA mapping used by the SA does not accurately plot the location or depth of the existing ditch at Site CFS1084 (see Appendix 3) • Development of Site CFS1084 will not have an adverse impact on the setting of nearby heritage assets (see Appendix 4)</p> <p>It is further considered that the evidence submitted with these representations provides sufficient justification for the allocation of our clients’ site, CFS1084 to meet the identified housing need in the Neighbourhood Plan Area</p>	
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>LB/HLB/1 - is titled 'Landscape', however bullet points a-c concern habitats and biodiversity. It is recommended they are incorporated within Policy LB/HLB/8: Biodiversity</p>	<p>Noted. a-c refer to the Landscape Character Assessment of Principal Timbered Farmlands</p>
		<p>LB/HLB/3 - As cited in the supporting paragraph 5.38 the main purpose of the policy is to protect views to the Malvern Hills AONB from the three view points. The policy wording should be amended to include reference to the AONB. Figure 3 would benefit from a more detailed base map.</p>	<p>Noted. Text and Maps altered</p>
		<p>LB/HLB/4 is not in accordance with NPPF para 203: The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. As drafted LB/HLB/4 does not make provision for a balanced judgement, but instead states proposals which affect a non-designated heritage asset must demonstrate how they protect or enhance the heritage asset; the implications being that proposals which do not protect or enhance will be refused. Suggested modification: To be supported, proposals which affect a non-designated heritage asset (a building or structure on the Local List [following adoption by Malvern Hills District Council] must demonstrate how they protect or enhance have regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset in weighing against the benefits of the proposal. PPG (18a-005) states: It is beneficial for any designated and non-designated heritage assets within the plan area to be clearly identified at the start of the plan-making process so they can be appropriately taken into account. Whilst it is appreciated the NP is awaiting the publication of the MHDC Local List, guidance from Heritage England incudes advice for Neighbourhood Plan Groups on identifying other previously unidentified heritage assets during the plan-making process.</p>	<p>Discussed in conjunction with MHDC slight wording change.</p>

<p>41. Resident: Ms J Cranston</p>	<p>O</p>	<p>Housing: Site Allocation: Evidence and Justification. Policy LB/H/5: Half of the designated area has been earmarked for a sports facility and I presume there would also be the possibility of pitches being used during the evenings, which would involve floodlights. This would not be in keeping with the village as we don't have street lights and floodlights would therefore be very obtrusive.</p> <p>Flooding and Drainage Policy LB/IFD/1: The A4103 also suffers from flash flooding around the designated site area and I would be very concerned as to whether any development on this site would divert this flooding, which could then affect residential properties in this area. The designated site also becomes water logged during long periods of rain and during the winter months</p> <p>Amenities, Health and well Being Policy LB/AHWB/1 Most villagers in Leigh Sinton I would imagine decided to live here for the green spaces, beautiful countryside, wildlife, peaceful and tranquil surroundings, this would definitely not be the case if there is further development and the "sports facility" included several football pitches, clubhouse, changing rooms etc, which I feel is not what the village community actually needs</p> <p>The proposed size of the "sports facilities" appears disproportionate to the number of villagers that would be likely to use it, which causes concern it will be utilised by people outside of the village which brings additional traffic congestion and a substantial increase in noise levels for a quiet village</p> <p>Highways and Infrastructure: You are aware there is very little infrastructure in the village, poor public transport links to Worcester, Malvern and surrounding villages, no cycle paths, many roads without pavements for safe walking and I presume there is a limit on the number of children that could attend the village school, so I'm unsure why Leigh Sinton is being targeted for more development?</p> <p>The main A4103 Hereford/Worcester Road is extremely busy with cars and large HGV lorries. There is already congestion joining the A4103 from Malvern by the village pub, access to the school via Stocks Lane and further</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Policy LB/IFD/1 is compiled to deal specifically with such situations.</p> <p>Your main point about the value of our surroundings is noted and echoed in the LBNP. However, there is a need in the community for some more formal recreational facilities.</p> <p>South Worcestershire Counties/ Malvern Hills District council have made a strategic allocation for housing for Leigh Sinton. A Neighbourhood Plan cannot seek to reduce that</p>
------------------------------------	----------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>development in this area will increase this, with another new road joining onto the A4103 from the new development, along with a proposed pedestrian crossing.</p> <p>As you are aware the majority of the village is already sited on the same side of the busy A4103 as the School, Shop, Take-away and Pub, however the designated site is on the opposite side of the A4103. Therefore if there does need to be future development in the village, I would have thought it would be better to consider land already on the same side as the School etc, as this would significantly reduce any potentially serious accidents crossing this busy main road and negotiating traffic congestion.</p> <p>Housing Site Allocation Policy LB/H/5 I am extremely concerned with the potential usage of the land on the proposed designated site, with half of the land potentially being used for Sports and recreation use and I note comments on the Leigh and Bransford Parish Council website regarding the NDP, where it is acknowledged that the questionnaire in 2015 did not give a clear outcome from villagers of requirements for community facilities, however despite this, other comments regarding the NDP state that the designated area is a “large site that will be limited for what residential development it can deliver; it will however be coming forward with a large area of a community sports facility”</p> <p>I really do not feel that this “large area of a community sports facility” would primarily be for villagers, should they even actually be interested in this and feel this is likely to be earmarked for Leigh and Bransford Badgers FC</p> <p>I believe that Leigh and Bransford Badgers FC are looking to site their football club in Leigh Sinton to secure funding from the Cala Homes development, which I presume was a condition in their planning application and you will see from their website that this is not a small village football club, but a considerably larger football club with in excess of 250 players according to their website. The club has also previously acknowledged that a very small percentage of their players actually come from Leigh Sinton!</p> <p>If the football club relocated to the designated area this would be severely detrimental, as they have advised that matches will be played most of the weekend (all day Saturday and half a day on Sunday), the numbers of cars therefore coming into the village would be considerable. I am also very</p>	<p>allocation .Other points are noted.</p> <p>Any facilities will be primarily for the use of villagers/ parishioners. Much of the area will be a large open space. There are no planning conditions regarding specific use of the open space.</p>
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>concerned with the level of noise this will bring for villagers enjoying their gardens over the weekend and also the residents in the Nursing Home adjacent to the designated site.</p> <p>Infrastructure – Moving Around Policy LB/IMA/4: There is a well used public footpath across the designated site, which has seen considerable increased usage during Covid and is still used regularly after lockdown</p>	The route of the public right of way will be retained.
42. Ms V Kirkham Natural England	C	Natural England does not have any specific comments on the Leigh and Bransford Neighbourhood Plan.	Acknowledged
43. Resident: Mr M Starr	O	<p>I have read with interest the Leigh and Bransford neighbourhood development plan and I commend the effort which has gone into producing an impressive document. However the problem I have with it is why is any more development needed in Leigh Sinton, it has seen considerable expansion over the last few years and enough is enough. Indeed the SWDP actually precludes any further development here. Can you find anyone in the village who wants further development ? Have you asked because if you had the answer will, in 9 out of 10 responses , be a resounding NO.</p> <p>When I read the plan I must admit some puzzlement over the recommendation that the preferred site on which to build 52 new houses is the field opposite the Primary school.</p> <p>First of all I should declare an interest as we live at 15 Nash Green which adjoins the field .</p> <p>Secondly I should declare that at 82 that I am not that much interested in the outcome of the consultation as I , probably , won't be around to experience the consequences of any decision and , additionally , the impact of any development will be mitigated by the</p>	<p>South Worcestershire Counties/ Malvern Hills District Council have made a strategic housing allocation for Leigh Sinton. A Neighbourhood Plan cannot seek to reduce such an allocation.</p> <p>The route of the public right of way will be maintained.</p> <p>All other points have been noted.</p>

distance that it will be away from our house. This being so my opinion is based on the reality of the effect the development will have on the environment and village. I apologise that I haven't used the dozens of response forms which would have been needed as many of my comments have no exact reference to points in the plan and indeed the effort of filling in the forms several times complete with the duplication of many of the details required and then sending them across the web is beyond me.

The plan is well presented with myriads of charts and diagrams but all in the abstract with no connection to the actual land which it proposes to develop. Have any of you been to see the field ?

The field consists of good agricultural land which has had crops every year to my knowledge for the past 32 years, why destroy it , we need agriculture to survive ?

It serves as an excellent wild life area, the moor hens and ducks which live on the Moat nest there and every year the moor hens have two broods and the ducks , hopefully , one . These birds provide an amenity for the village as particularly during the summer months the Moat and its wild life i.e the birds and the scores of fish in the Moat are an attraction for families to come and feed them . Do you want to wreck this ? Additionally the field and Nash Green are an area for other wild life e.g bats , toads , newts , pheasants and other flora and fauna which create a fantastic biodiversity area. Do you want to create a barren land ?

Through the middle of the field there runs a well worn public footpath which leads from the village to a network of other footpaths. Every day it is used by numerous walkers , including groups , and during last year's lockdown usage was regularly over 100 people. Do you want to destroy this ?

The Plan talks of a football playing area , this has to show that the writer has not been there . Once winter sets in the field becomes a morass of mud and lying water (the same applies to my land), you won't be playing football on it or any other play activity. I also feel sorry for those who buy property as their gardens will be sodden and waterlogged.

Why are you planning to build houses which will be on the opposite side of the A4103 main road from all the village amenities i.e school, pub, shop , take away etc , this will definitely be creating a safety hazard especially as the target buyer for the houses is likely to be families with young children. Is this sensible ?

Talking about safety in the space of approximately 1/3rd of a mile you have two main roads , 2 side roads and the entrance to the primary school joining the A4103 you now plan to add another road to the mix , almost certainly quite close to the school entrance . Is this wise?

Emotion aside have you consider the practical problems e.g the Covenant relating to the field and the Moat, the system dealing with overflow from the Moat , the sewage problem , the oak tree (over 5 cubic metres in volume) , the network of high voltage cables across the field , the access existing occupants of Nash Green have to the field and the many other practical and legal issues involved . The biggest problem that you , as Parish Councillors , will face is that if any development causes the intricate overflow system to breakdown and flooding of the Waterside nursing home and Nash Green occurs then you could be financially responsible , have you thought about that ? For your own sake it might be sensible for the Council to consider purchasing a considerable area of the field adjacent to the Moat in order to ensure the maintenance of the banks, the Moat outlet and overflow. MHDC are already responsible for maintenance of a significant stretch of the bank of the Moat.

		<p>In summary you need to rethink as to whether you need any new houses at all and also consider the implications of your choice if you want to press on as your present option presents legal and practical problems which have not been considered in your plan. Some argue that if the plan is not approved then it will be a free for all for builders to do what and where they want this is nonsense . If the Parish Council ,MHDC and Worcestershire County Council don't like those plans they can refuse to cooperate.</p> <p>Additionally have you consider the implications of the proposed new Government planning laws which are moving the focus away from building in the countryside see articles in the media this month about the anticipated changes. Finally can I mention a quote from Boris Johnson from his speech to the Conservative Party Conference this week that he wants " new homes , not on green fields , not just jammed in the south-east but beautiful homes on brownfield sites " and the headline from Thursday's Telegraph " Boris Johnson pledges no more homes will be built on green fields".</p>	
44. Dr S Cumella: CPRE	C	<p>Many thanks for sending me a copy of the draft NDP. I edited the neighbourhood plan for Martley, Knightwick and Doddenham, and therefore appreciate the enormous amount of work involved. The main thing I have learnt from your draft plan is that it shows the failure of our planning system to create sustainable village communities. Leigh Sinton, in particular, has been allowed to expand on either side of a busy main road that does not feel safe for cycling or walking. Poor public transport means that access to employment, primary healthcare and local towns requires the use of cars. Many households probably need two or more.</p> <p>I will draft a formal CPRE response when the next draft has been completed. In the meantime, I suggest that you consider a policy that</p>	Acknowledged

		requires all new housing developments to be permeable, to enable the creation of footpath and cycle routes away from the main roads. Your team could draft a proposed network of this kind. I also think it is reasonable to require a pause in any further housing construction until public transport has been improved. This was the approach taken by the SWDPR for its proposed expansion at Rushwick.	
45 Cotheridge Parish Council	C	Thank you for bringing the Plan to the Parish Council's attention and we wishing you well for the remainder of the formal process including the local referendum	Acknowledged

APPENDIX 5: Extracts from 2015 Questionnaire

Extract: Introductory Text From Questionnaire

We need to create that evidence base and we can only do that by using the responses you make in this survey. Please reply to the survey as fully as you can. If you run out of space write on the back of the relevant page or add a sheet of paper.

We are the people who care about where we live and the more we can articulate what we care about the clearer our voice will be.

Leigh and Bransford Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group

*If you would like more copies of the survey it is available to download on the Leigh and Bransford Parish website. At the time of going to press you will also be able fill in the survey on-line on the web-site. If you're filling the survey in on paper then please return it in the envelope provided by 14th September. That is also the deadline for the on-line survey. Please fill in what you want to fill in. The more you contribute the greater our evidence base. **Please return in the envelope provided for confidentiality. You can post it or you can leave it in the box at The Fold or Leigh Sinton Post Office.***

Extract: Additional Text in Collated Version

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE

This version of the questionnaire includes the collated responses after each question.

For those questions with an "objective" answer; yes/no, or a score, the number of responses for each answer is included in a separate table. Each table contains the responses for each of the seven areas: Bransford, Brockamin, Coles Green, Leigh, Leigh Sinton, Sandlin, and Smith End Green. The columns headed "No." indicate the number of responses from each area with the "%" column showing the percentage of responses for that area for each answer. The "Total" columns ("No." and "%") add all responses from each area.

There were a number of "subjective" questions, "What would you like to see about....?" etc. to which there is no single answer. Naturally there was a wide range of responses and an attempt has been made to group, or trend, these answers, which are also presented as tables. The tables are only a summary of the many useful comments, which will be expanded in the text of the Plan.

Extract from Questionnaire: Original

3. Development and Design

a. Given that development is taking place in the Parish and will in the future, what type of housing do you think should be built and why? (For example: bungalow/affordable/rental/ 5 bedroom executive/2 bedroom/flats/sheltered etc).

b. How important is the design of new building to you? 1 = not important 5 = very important *(Please circle)*

1 2 3 4 5

c. Is building design important to you? *(Please tick)*

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

d. Why?

e. What sort of building would you **not** like to see?

Extract from Questionnaire: Collated

3. Development and Design

- a. Given that development is taking place in the Parish and will in the future, what type of housing do you think should be built and why? (For example: bungalow/affordable/rental/ 5 bedroom executive/2 bedroom/flats/sheltered etc).

Q3.a GIVEN THAT DEVELOPMENT IS TAKING PLACE IN THE PARISH AND WILL IN THE FUTURE, WHAT TYPE OF HOUSING DO YOU THINK SHOULD BE BUILT AND WHY? (FOR EXAMPLE: BUNGALOW/ AFFORDABLE/ RENTAL/ 5 BED EXECUTIVE/ 2 BEDROOM/ FLATS/SHELTERED ETC)	
A. In character	98
A. Affordable (With adequate gardens, not separate, not 2 nd class). Many respondents stressed these should be for local people.	64
A. Mixed developments	57
A. Bungalows. (Provision for local residents emphasised)	44
A. Executive	14
A. Sheltered	14
A. Renovate existing/ brownfield sites	4
A. Self build	1

- b. How important is the design of new building to you? 1 = not important 5 = very important (Please circle)

1 2 3 4 5

Q3b: ON A SCORE OF ONE TO FIVE HOW IMPORTANT IS THE DESIGN OF NEW BUILDING FOR YOU?																
Score	Bransford		Brockamin		Coles Grn		Leigh		Leigh Sinton		Sandlin		S E Green		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	5	0	0	1	17	8	4
1	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	2
2	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	4	2
3	6	17	4	27	1	13	4	12	7	7	0	0	1	17	23	11
4	6	17	1	7	4	50	6	18	23	21	0	0	1	17	41	19
5	21	58	9	60	3	38	21	64	68	64	8	100	3	50	133	62
Total	36		15		8		33		107		8		6		213	

Extract from Questionnaire: Collated

c. Is building design important to you? *(Please tick)*

Q3c: IS BUILDING DESIGN IMPORTANT FOR YOU?																
	Bransford		Brockamin		Coles Grn		Leigh		Leigh Sinton		Sandlin		S E Green		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No answer	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4	0	0	1	17	8	4
Yes	29	81	11	73	8	100	29	88	97	91	8	100	4	67	186	87
No	6	17	4	27	0	0	2	6	6	6	0	0	1	17	19	9
Total	36		15		8		33		107		8		6		213	

d. Why?

Q3.d WHY IS BUILDING DESIGN IMPORTANT TO YOU?	
A. Developments should be in character	98
A. Environmentally integrated/ low-impact	6
A. Already a good mix; new houses can be individual but still in keeping with local character.	General
Q3.a and 3.d A. Many respondents indicated that houses should have sufficient off-road parking, and adequate gardens.	

e. What sort of building would you **not** like to see?

Q3.e WHAT SORT OF BUILDING WOULD YOU NOT LIKE TO SEE?	
A. Town houses, high rise, flats, high roof line	100
A. Large estates, modern, boxes, inadequate parking	32
A. Trendy, not traditional, not in keeping, flat roof	18
A. Executive	18
A. Affordable (already sufficient local provision)	10
A. Barn conversions, properties with inadequate parking, sheltered, high maintenance, terraces.	Individual answers

f. Do you think that all new building should include integral environmental features?
(Please tick)