

Malvern Town Neighbourhood Plan
Malvern Town Council and Malvern Hills District Council
Response to Examiner's Request for Clarification (31st December 2018)
17th January 2019

Points for Clarification	Response from Malvern Town Council and Malvern Hills District Council
<u>Policy MG1 - Local Green Space</u>	
I request clarification of contact by the Town Council, during the period of Neighbourhood Plan preparation, with landowners regarding the proposed designation of Hayslan Fields as Local Green Space.	<p>The Town Council consulted Malvern St James during the following stages of the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy review event at Lyttelton Rooms - 18 July 2017 • Regulation 14 draft plan - 17 November 2017 - 26 January 2018 • Visual Study - 11 September - 9 October 2018 <p>At all three of the above stages Hayslan Fields was proposed as a Local Green Space.</p>
<u>Policy MV1 - Key Views</u>	
Please clarify which evidence base statements define views, in terms of direction and extent, to be considered within the Exceptional Key View Zone	<p>Table 4 of the Visual Study Report (page A61) includes a photograph illustrating the proposed Exceptional Key View Zone and describes a number of high value attributes within the proposed zone.</p> <p>The Visual Study Report does not, however, define the direction or extent of views from within the Exceptional Key View Zone.</p> <p>The Town Council wish to point out that the Exceptional Key View Zone contains multiple viewpoints. Paragraph 2.22 of the Visual Study Report explains that the category of 'Exceptional' applies to views within which very high / high value factors / attributes are present, either singularly or in combination and that the factors which</p>

	<p>contribute to high levels of local visual value are set out in paragraph 4.4 of the Visual Study Report. In light of this, there is no single focus, or specific direction of, views from within the Exceptional Key View Zone.</p>
<p>Please clarify which evidence base statements define the direction and from what distance views of Exceptional Key Focal Points are to be considered</p>	<p>Table 2 of the Visual Study Report (pages A35 to A40) includes photographs which illustrate the proposed 18 Exceptional Key Focal Points and provides a commentary on attributes within the focal points.</p> <p>The Visual Study Report does not, however, define the direction or distance from which views at the Exceptional Key Focal Points are to be considered.</p> <p>The Town Council wish to point out that the Exceptional Key Focal Points are the subject of multiple viewpoints, as explained in paragraph 2.44 of the Visual Study Report. In light of this, the commentaries on pages A35 to A40 of the Visual Study Report, do not define the direction of, or distance from which, views of Key Focal Points to be considered.</p>
<p>Whilst descriptions in the Visual Study Report of Exceptional Key View Routes refer to views in the direction, or both directions of the route, where is there a definition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • regarding extent of view to be considered; and • the approach to be adopted with respect to view of sites adjacent to both sides of the route. 	<p>Table 3 of the Visual Study Report (pages A47 to A52) includes photographs which illustrate the proposed 12 Exceptional Key View Routes and describes a number of visual attributes from within the proposed routes.</p> <p>The Visual Study Report does not, however, define the extent of the views to be considered.</p> <p>The Visual Study Report does not define the approach to be adopted with respect to views of sites adjacent to both sides of a route.</p> <p>The Town Council wish to point out that they consider that paragraph 4.4 of the Visual Study Report sets out high value factors which are visible within a given view at a given location.</p>

<p>In that all four Exceptional Key Gateways include Exceptional Key View Routes and at least one Exceptional Key Viewpoint, what additional development management approach is introduced by the Exceptional Key Gateway designation and what is the significance of the radius of the Exceptional Key Gateway indicator?</p>	<p>Paragraph 4.19 of the Visual Study Report says that the extent of the Key Gateways “area of influence” varies depending on their specific landscape / townscape context.</p> <p>The Town Council consider that the radius of the Exceptional Key Gateways reflect their approximate ‘area of influence’. The District Council note that the radii / areas of influence appear to be equi-distance in all directions for the four proposed Exceptional Key Gateways.</p> <p>The District Council and Town Council confirm that no additional development management approach is introduced by the Exceptional Key Gateway designation.</p>
<p>Figure 5.3 includes indicators outside the Neighbourhood Plan Area which it may not. Could you please clarify that it is not intended to extend the Neighbourhood Plan Area, which would of course involve considerable delay.</p>	<p>The District Council and Town Council confirm that there is no intention to extend the designated Neighbourhood Area.</p> <p>To address the issue of indicators outside the Neighbourhood Plan Area, it is suggested that consideration could be given to inserting the following text at the end of Policy MV1: <i>“This policy will only apply to land within the Neighbourhood Plan area.”</i></p>
<p><u>Policy MC2 - Healthy Communities</u></p>	
<p>Could you please clarify whether it is intended?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the first paragraph new major residential development should be defined as 100 or more dwellings; and 	<p>In relation to the first paragraph, which relates to applicants demonstrating that there is sufficient capacity in General Practices and Dental Practices, it is considered that the threshold should be 100+ dwellings. This would align with paragraph 2.6.13 of the SWDP Developer Contributions SPD (July 2018) which says “developments of over 100 dwellings will normally be expected to contribute to the provision of additional primary healthcare infrastructure unless there is more than enough spare capacity at the nearest GP surgery to accommodate the additional number of residents likely to require primary healthcare registration arising as a result of the development” See link below for the SPD:</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> in the second paragraph proposals for new major development should be interpreted as proposals for new large-scale development (in respect of residential proposals 100 or more dwellings or 5,000 square metres of non-residential floorspace). 	<p>http://www.swdevelopmentplan.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Developer-Contributions-SPD-2018-Revision-Approved.pdf</p> <p>In relation to the second paragraph, it is considered that the threshold should be aligned to the Planning for Health in South Worcestershire SPD (September 2017). This SPD requires, at Table 1 (page 32), a Health Impact Assessment for residential and mixed use sites of 25+ dwellings, employment sites of 5+ ha and retail developments of 500+ square metres. See link below for the SPD: http://www.swdevelopmentplan.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Adopted-Planning-for-Health-SPD-Sept-2017.pdf</p>
<p><u>Policy ME3 - Employment Development Within Existing Industrial Estates and Business Parks</u></p>	
<p>Could you please clarify whether a modification to both policies ME3 and ME4 with the insertion of an additional criterion as follows “Or they are development forming part of a scheme for implementation of a strategic allocation of the South Worcestershire Development Plan” would satisfactorily resolve the issue raised in the Regulation 16 representation of RPS.</p>	<p>SWDP 56 (North East Malvern) allocates 56.84 hectares (gross) of land for a mixed-use urban extension, including 10 hectares of land for employment-generating purposes.</p> <p>RPS identifies, at paragraph 2.29 of its representation, a potential conflict between Policy SWDP 56 and Policies ME3 and ME4. This is due to part of the Newland Depot and Recycling Centre, designated as an Existing Industrial Estate in paragraph 5.9.14 and identified in Figure 5.8, overlapping with the SWDP 56 site allocation.</p> <p>In light of the above, it is considered that the suggested additional criterion would help to resolve this issue.</p> <p>In addition, it is suggested that the part of the Newland Depot and Recycling Centre which overlaps with the SWDP 56 allocation could be deleted from Figure 5.8. The amended boundary of the Newland Depot and Recycling Centre in Figure 5.8 would be as shown below:</p>



Could you please clarify what mapping adjustments would ensure the Neighbourhood Plan is not promoting less development than that included in strategic policy SWDP 56.

RPS identifies, at paragraph 2.31 of its representation, that the mixed use allocation relating to SWDP 56 is not correct on the Key Diagram to the draft Neighbourhood Plan because it does not include the northern extent of the SWDP 56 allocation.

	It is accepted that this is a cartographical error that needs to be amended to align with the SWDP56 allocation.
--	--