

Hanley Castle Neighbourhood Plan

Schedule of MHDC Officer Comments

April 2018

General Comments

The Framework, South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP) and the Hanley Castle Neighbourhood Plan provide a suite of policies against which planning applications will be assessed. Together, they should provide a practical framework within which planning decisions can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency.

The draft neighbourhood plan includes an extensive range of policies, some of which overlap with those in SWDP.

Planning Practice Guidance on Neighbourhood Planning says that proportionate, robust evidence should support the choices made and the approach taken. For most policies the supporting text has been presented in the form of lists which does not always help in presenting a coherent or logical reasoned explanation to the reader, applicant or decision maker about how the information has supported the choices made and the approach taken.

It is noted that each policy has an "Introduction" section, followed by a list of "Benefits / Outcomes". In many cases the Benefits / Outcomes appear to repeat the points made in the Introduction. It is also noted that some of the "Supporting Evidence" is based on the opinions expressed by residents in a local survey. Whilst the opinions and aspirations of local residents are an important indicator of local support and provide a mandate to develop a policy, it is considered that they do not necessarily provide proportionate, robust evidence.

It is also noted that each policy in the Neighbourhood Plan includes a list of linked "National & Local Policies". The lists do not explain whether national and local policies have informed the proposed neighbourhood plan policy or whether there is any conflict between the policies based on local evidence. It is also considered that some of the listed national and local policies are not strongly linked to the proposed neighbourhood plan policy. For example, it is not clear how the County Council's Health and Wellbeing Strategy and the South Worcestershire Health SPD are linked to Policy BHN6 which seeks to protect sites of biological interest.

Planning Practice Guidance says that “wider community aspirations than those relating to development and use of land can be included in a neighbourhood plan, but actions dealing with non land use matters should be clearly identifiable. For example, set out in a companion document or annex.” The Neighbourhood Plan proposes that land-use policies are shaded in pale orange whilst wider community aspirations / actions for the Parish Council are shaded in pale green. To provide clarity for decision makers and applicants it is suggested that actions for the Parish Council could be included in an Appendix to the Plan.

A very positive aspect of the Plan is that it proposes to allocate 5 sites for residential development (including SWDP59/6). All of the proposed sites are outside, but appear to be coterminous with, the existing development boundary. The Plan proposes that the development boundary is revised to include the allocated sites. It is suggested that the Neighbourhood Plan includes a map showing the proposed revised development boundary.

In terms of presentation style, it is noted that most of the Neighbourhood Plan policies present lists of sites or criteria as bullet points. In some policies (for example, MnGr4, RE2, and Des 1) the lists are shown as roman numerals, whilst in other policies (for example PCR1) the lists are shown as numbers. For consistency and ease of reference, it is suggested that all policy lists or criteria are labelled the same, possibly as a, b, c or i, ii, iii.

Chapter / Policy	Comments
Introduction	<p>Section 1.3, para 1, 2nd sentence – It is suggested that the end of the sentence should read “publicised the neighbourhood area application from Hanley Castle Parish Council <i>2 May to 13 June 2014</i>”.</p> <p>It is suggested that sub-section 1.7 may be more appropriately be re-titled “Actions for the Parish Council”.</p>
The Hanleys – Our Villages	<p>It is suggested that Map 2 showing Landscape Character Areas could be clearer.</p> <p>Section 2.2, para 3 – It is suggested that a weblink is provided to the relevant County Council webpage.</p> <p>2.3.4, 1st sentence – It is suggested that the text is amended to “Within the</p>

	parish residents have access to <i>there are 2 public houses ...</i> "
The Process for Producing the Plan	<p>Section 3 outlines the process that has been undertaken so far to develop the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Section 3, para 3, bullet point 4 – It is suggested that the word “confidential” be deleted.</p> <p>There are instances where the neighbourhood plan uses the present tense. For example, in the sub-section on Publicity (section 3.4) the text says that “Regular updates are also posted on the parish website”. In the Made version of the Plan it is suggested that the past tense would be more appropriate.</p> <p>Section 3.6 and Diagram (page 16) showing Plan Approval Process - It is suggested that the process will need to be amended to reflect the outcome of the examination and possible arrangements for a referendum.</p>
Aims and Objectives	<p>Aim 2, Objective 2– Suggest that “SWDP Malvern Development Boundary” is replaced by “SWDP 2”</p> <p>Suggest that references to “nb: There is no specific views policy” are deleted at Aim 2 Objective 5, Aim 3 Objective 7, Aim 4 Objective 6.</p> <p>Aim 4 Objective 2– It is suggested that the “nb” is replaced by SWDP 21 and SWDP 27.</p> <p>In relation land-use policies being shaded pale orange and wider community aspirations / actions for the Parish Council being shaded in pale green (page 22) please see previous comments.</p>

<p>Policy MnGr 1 - Housing Mix</p> <p>Proposals for new housing should deliver a range of house types, sizes and tenures. There is particular need for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable housing • Starter homes • Two and three bedroom family homes • Homes for the elderly or disabled <p>Applicants should demonstrate how the proposal will meet these local needs.</p>	<p>Policy MnGr1 supports proposals that provide a range of housing sizes, types and tenures without setting out what specific mix would be required. The policy puts the onus on applicants to demonstrate how the proposal will meet local needs.</p> <p>Generally, it is considered that the policy will only be relevant to sites where it is intended to build a group of dwellings.</p> <p>MnGr1 appears to have regard to paragraph 50 of the Framework.</p> <p>The policy is considered to be in general conformity with SWDP 14 which relates to residential developments of 5 or more units.</p> <p>Given that the policy does not address self build, it is suggested that paragraphs 2 and 3 on self build be deleted.</p> <p>Para 13 refers to Appendix E which is not included in the Neighbourhood Plan. Is this referring to information in Section V of the supporting document, part two?</p> <p>It is noted that evidence supporting the need for affordable housing is provided as supporting text for Policy MnGr2. It is suggested that this evidence might have been more appropriately included to support Policy MnGr1.</p>
<p>Policy MnGr 2 - Affordable Housing</p> <p><u>Affordable Housing Construction</u></p> <p>Developers are encouraged to construct all affordable housing in accordance with Lifetime Homes Standards.</p> <p><u>Tenancy Mix</u></p> <p>Based upon evidence gathered for the parish; where Affordable Housing is</p>	<p>Policy MnGr2 seeks to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Encourage affordable housing to be built to the Lifetime Homes Standard, (ii) Ensure that at least 25% of affordable homes are for shared ownership, and (iii) Support rural exception sites “beyond, but reasonably adjacent to,

<p>being provided then a minimum of 25% of the Affordable homes should be for shared-ownership (intermediate housing) unless viability or other local factors show a robust justification for a different mix.</p> <p><u>Affordable Housing on Exception Sites</u></p> <p>Proposals will be supported for the development of small-scale affordable housing schemes on rural exception sites on small sites beyond, but reasonably adjacent to, the development boundaries of the villages, where housing would not normally be permitted by other policies. In particular sites involving the redevelopment of brownfield land will be supported.</p>	<p>the development boundaries”</p> <p><u>Lifetime Homes Standard</u></p> <p>The Written Ministerial Statement of March 2015 indicated that local planning authorities and qualifying bodies should not set in their emerging plans any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings. In effect these matters are to be addressed in existing and future versions of the Building Regulations.</p> <p>On this basis, construction to Lifetime Homes Standards is encouraged, but not be required.</p> <p><u>25% of affordable homes to be for shared ownership</u></p> <p>This policy will only be relevant on sites where it is intended to build a group of homes.</p> <p>Very detailed evidence is provided to justify the need for affordable housing, and particularly for shared ownership. The 2016 data is relevant, but it is suggested that the 2008 data may now be out-of-date.</p> <p><u>Rural Exception Sites</u></p> <p>This policy is consistent with SWDP 16 (Rural Exception Sites) which supports affordable housing on small sites beyond, but reasonably adjacent to, the development boundaries of villages or the main built-up area of a village (in cases where there is no development boundary).</p> <p>Para 19 relates to the management of lettings. Please see comments on Policy</p>
--	--

	<p>MnGr3.</p> <p>Para 22 – It is not clear what para 22 is seeking to say.</p> <p>Para 23 appears to repeat the points made in para 1.</p>
<p>Policy MnGr 3 - Allocation of Affordable Housing</p> <p>All affordable housing in Hanley Castle parish provided by the Plan or by exception sites will be subject to a local connection, meaning that people with a strong local connection to the parish and whose needs are not met by the open market will be first to be offered the tenancy or shared ownership of the home. In this context a strong local connection is as defined by the MHDC Rural Lettings Policy as approved in June 2005 and any further revisions or successor policies.</p>	<p>MnGr 3 seeks to secure any affordable housing that is developed in the parish for local people in accordance with the MHDC Rural Lettings Policy.</p> <p>However, the policy is about the management of lettings and would not inform decision makers with an indication of how they should react to a development proposal. It is therefore suggested that this policy be included in the part of the Plan that deals with community aspirations / actions for the Parish Council.</p> <p>Para 6 is not entirely correct. The South Worcestershire Councils Affordable Housing SPD was adopted in October 2016. Local connections for villages in the rural areas in Malvern Hills are defined in the Malvern Hills Rural Lettings Policy.</p>
<p>Policy MnGr 4 - Infill / Backland Housing in the Parish</p> <p>Applications for small residential developments on infill and backland sites within the parish will be supported subject to proposals being well designed and meeting all relevant requirements set out in other policies in this plan and the SWDP, and where such development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. fills a small, restricted gap in the continuity of existing frontage buildings or on other sites within the built-up area of the village where the site is closely surrounded by buildings; ii. will not involve the outward extension of the built-up area of the village; iii. if backland, is not considered to be an unneighbourly 	<p>Policy MnGr4 supports infill development subject to design, size and residential amenity considerations.</p> <p>The wording of MnGr4 appears to potentially support plots for self-build up to 3 bedrooms even if it does not meet criterion i) to iv). Is this what is intended?</p> <p>The final part of Policy MnGr 4 relating to not all gaps being appropriate for infill does not provide a practical framework within which planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency.</p> <p>Para 6 – Whilst SWDP13 is relevant to MnGr4, it is considered that the Reasoned Justification information relating to 5-year supply calculations and windfall</p>

<p>development that requires unsuitable access, reduces the privacy of adjoining properties, unacceptably increases housing density or is inconsistent with the character of the locality;</p> <p>iv. provides homes to a maximum size of three bedrooms; OR</p> <p>v. provides the plots for self-build development of homes to a maximum size of three bedrooms.</p> <p>However not all gaps may be appropriate for infill development as they may form important features in the settlement and/or allow attractive views to be gained of features beyond the site. In such cases development will not be permitted.</p>	<p>development is not relevant and should be deleted.</p> <p>Para 10 – Planning law requires that planning applications be determined in accordance with the development plan. It is considered that para 10 does not provide a framework within which applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency.</p>
<p>Policy MnGr 5 - Scale of New Development</p> <p>Planning permission will only be granted for a maximum of 10 new homes, on any identified site outside of the SWDP allocation, unless there is an agreed master plan demonstrating the phasing of development over a number of years.</p>	<p>Policy MnGr 5 seeks to limit the size of new housing developments to no more than 10 dwellings.</p> <p>The justification for the policy is based on historical context and the desire for social integration.</p> <p>The Framework urges local planning authorities to “boost significantly the supply of housing...” Neighbourhood plans are expected to play a supporting role in terms of this, bringing forward sites for residential development. However, it appropriately follows that relatively small rural Category 1 and 3 villages such as Hanley Swan and Hanley Castle will play a modest role, consistent with SWDP2B (Development Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy).</p>
<p>Policy MnGr 6 - Incremental Growth</p> <p>The NDP supports the development of up to 50 dwellings (comprising both conversions and new build) over the plan period within the parish with no more than 30 dwellings* to be granted planning permission in</p>	<p>Policy MnGr 6 supports the development of up to 50 dwellings in the period to 2030, but no more than 30 to be granted consent in any one five year period.</p> <p>This may be contrary to the Framework which seeks to boost significantly the</p>

<p>any rolling five-year period.</p> <p>* This includes the SWDP allocation</p>	<p>supply of housing, and the presumption in favour of sustainable development unless it can be demonstrate that the limit of 30 is based on evidence, for example, infrastructure constraints.</p> <p>Para 6 suggests that the SWDP allocation (SWDP 59/6), together with recent planning consents, will lead to a significant increase in new dwellings in Hanley Castle. Some of the other supporting evidence, such as reduced bus services and closure of the butchers, however, is not considered relevant to MnGr6.</p>
<p>Policy MnGr 7 - Preferred Site Allocations</p> <p>Site 1 – Adjacent to Chapmans Orchard - (SWDP nominated site where permission for 4 dwellings already granted) Site 2 – Welland Road / Picken End corner Site 3 – Between Hillview Close and St Gabriel’s Church Site 4 – Worcester Road, west side Site 7 – Albion Lodge Care Home</p> <p>The boundary to sites allocated for development outside and adjoining the existing settlement boundary will form the basis of an extension to the existing development boundary as set out on the Sites Map. Where a housing allocation is not coterminous with the development boundary, it will not be included in the boundary.</p>	<p>Policy MnGr7 proposes 4 housing site allocations over-and-above the 20 dwellings allocated in SWDP 59/6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Site 2 – Welland Road / Picken End corner (10 dwellings) ii) Site 3 – Between Hillview Close and St Gabriel’s Church (9 dwellings) iii) Site 4 – Worcester Road, west side (3 dwellings) iv) Site 7 – Albion Lodge Care Home <p>Policy MnGr7 also proposes that the development boundaries for Hanley Castle and Hanley Swan be amended to include site allocations outside but adjoining the existing development boundary. This would be consistent with the approach in SWDP2C, footnote 2.</p> <p>It is noted that sites 2, 3, 4 and 7 are all outside but adjacent to the existing development boundary. Maps 4 and 5 which show the existing development boundaries for Hanley Castle and Hanley Swan would need to be amended to show the proposed revised development boundaries.</p> <p>If the Neighbourhood Plan is seeking to allocate sites it is suggested that the policy be re-named as Site Allocations.</p>

	<p>Paragraph 4 says that the methodology used for assessing site suitability can be found in the supporting document. It is suggested that the reasoned justification could usefully include a weblink to the supporting document.</p> <p>Given that the Neighbourhood Plan is proposing 5 sites for residential development (including SWDP 59/6) it is suggested that reference to site numbers 5 and 6 are deleted and that Site 7 is renumbered as Site 5.</p> <p>Beneath Policy MnGr7 it says that “Site 8 was reserved but not used.” It is not clear what this means.</p> <p>Paragraph 1, sentence 2 of the Introduction refers to the SWDP providing for “windfall developments on unspecified sites.” This is misleading. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.</p> <p>Para 5 also relates to windfall development and is slightly misleading given that the purpose of Policy MnGr7 is to allocate sites for development.</p> <p>The section titled National & Local Policies refers to SWDP 2 (Development Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy). SWDP 2C defines the open countryside as land beyond any development boundary. SWDP 2C says that in the open countryside, development will be strictly controlled. However, SWDP 2H also says that the SWDP is supportive of development proposals that are promoted through neighbourhood planning mechanisms, where these proposals do not compromise the delivery of the plan’s strategic policies and proposals. Whilst the proposed site allocations are outside the existing development boundary, Policy MnGr7 proposes to extend the development boundary to include those sites</p>
--	---

	<p>outside but adjacent to the development boundary.</p> <p>In a number of places Policy MnGr7 refers to a settlement boundary or village settlement. For consistency with the SWDP and to avoid any potential confusion, it is suggested that the term “development boundary” is used. Aim 1, Objective 3 also refers to settlement boundaries.</p> <p>It is suggested that the maps relating to Sites 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7 should include a title, a key and show the proposed revised development boundary.</p> <p>Paras 9, 13, 16 and 19 refer to a mix of property types. The mix of housing types will be determined by other policies and considerations and is considered to be outside the scope of Policy MnGr7.</p> <p>Paras 22 and 23 – The position regarding Site 7 is not clear in Policy MnGr7 and does not provide a practical framework within which planning decisions can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency. Para 23 says that planning consent has been granted for Phase 1 development, but it is not clear from Para 22 whether the Neighbourhood Plan is allocating land for Phase 2 or not.</p>
<p>Policy MnGr 8 - Siting of Local Businesses</p> <p>Other than home based businesses, new business premises should only be developed within the boundaries of the existing business centres (see inset plan); which are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hanley Workshops • Merebrook Industrial Estate • Willow End Park 	<p>Policy MnGr8 supports the intensification (but not extension) of 6 existing employment sites.</p> <p>Policy MnGr8 also supports the development of the old incinerator site at Hayler’s End for industrial / commercial use (Use Classes B1 or B8) within the original boundaries when it was an operational incinerator.</p> <p>Policy MnGr8 supports the further development of Blackmore Park in accordance with SWDP 54.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acorn Business Centre • Cygnet Business Centre • Walnut Trading Estate (opposite incinerator) <p>Intensification within the boundaries of these sites will prevent their expansion onto prime agricultural land as all are located in open countryside.</p> <p>The Parish Council supports the further development of the Blackmore Park site (as per SWDP 54) as this is a brownfield development offering considerable space to expand employment opportunities.</p> <p>Additionally proposals for the industrial / commercial development (Use classes B1 or B8) of the old incinerator site in Hayler’s End will be supported provided they are limited to within the original boundaries of the site when it was operational. (See inset plan.)</p> <p>Proposals for a change of use of existing premises to business purposes will not be approved if they will result in a detrimental impact upon local residents.</p>	<p>The Framework and the SWDP are seeking to actively promote economic development. It is considered that the first part of the policy may not be in strict conformity with the SWDP 12 (Employment in Rural Areas) which supports the expansion of existing employment sites in rural areas where it has been demonstrated that intensification of the existing site is not viable or practical.</p> <p>Para 7 says that “SWDP 54 is also proposing...” This is not strictly correct. SWDP 54 has allocated 5.4 ha of land at Blackmore Park for B1, B2 and B8 employment uses. SWDP 54 does not include specific references to promoting green technologies.</p> <p>Para 21, bullet 1 - Recognises that the first part of MnGr8 may not be in strict conformity with SWDP 12, and explains this on the grounds of vacancies and unused space on existing employment sites. Evidence in paras 2 to 8 indicates limited vacancies or opportunities for intensification.</p> <p>Para 21, bullet 4– It should be noted that SWDP12 is considered to be consistent with para 28 of the Framework.</p> <p>It is noted that the employment sites on Map 6 are numbered 9 to 15 rather than 1 to 7. Para 9 says the reason for this is that it continues the numbering for the housing allocations (even though there are only 5 proposed housing allocations). This appears to be slightly confusing.</p> <p>Para 9 says that individual site assessments can be found in the supporting document. It would be helpful if a weblink to the document was provided.</p> <p>Para 12 suggests that Policy MnGr8 will support the tourist industry, but it is not clear how it would do this.</p>
--	---

<p>Policy MnGr 9 - Heavy Goods Traffic</p> <p>Any proposal requiring planning permission to change the use of land in the parish to General Industrial Use (B2) or distribution and storage uses (B8), or other uses which would generate heavy goods traffic, must demonstrate with the assistance of a Transport Statement that the proposal will not have an unacceptable effect upon the quality of life of residents through the generation of increased noise, vibration and pollution.</p>	<p>Policy MnGr 9 proposes that any (all?) development proposals in the parish requiring a change of use to use classes to B2 (General Industry) or B8 (Storage or Distribution) must submit a Transport Assessment to demonstrate that the development will not have an unacceptable impact on residents through increased noise, vibration and pollution.</p> <p>The Framework makes it clear that transport policies have an important role to play in facilitating sustainable development and in contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives.</p> <p>Paragraph 32 of the Framework says that developments that generate <u>significant</u> amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Currently, Policy MnGr9 is seeking to apply to any (presumably all) proposals for change of used to use classes B2 or B8. It is suggested that it should be made clearer that Policy MnGr 9 would only apply to change of land use to land use classes B2 and B8 that would generate significant amounts of movement.</p> <p>In relation to relevant National & Local Policies (paras 5 to 11), it is suggested that SWDP’s 8, 12, 53 and 55 are not directly relevant – QinetiQ and the Three Counties Showground are outside the Hanley Castle Neighbourhood Area.</p>
<p>Policy MnGr 10 - Disused or Redundant Buildings</p> <p>The reuse of redundant or disused buildings where it would improve, restore or maintain a building may be supported if the proposed use meets the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) it would lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting; ii) the design respects the character and significance of the redundant or disused building; 	<p>Policy MnGr 10 potentially supports the re-use of disused or redundant buildings.</p> <p>The intention of Policy MnGr 10 appears to be consistent with the Framework, paragraph 55 which says that isolated homes in the countryside should be avoided unless there are special circumstances, such as where development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii) it is compatible with neighbouring uses; iv) the existing building is of permanent and substantial construction capable of conversion without major or complete reconstruction; and v) the existing building is capable of accommodating the proposed new use without the need for substantial alteration or extension, ancillary buildings, or development which individually or taken together would adversely affect the character or appearance of the building or have a detrimental impact on its surroundings and landscape setting. 	<p>However, whilst para 55 of the Framework relates to housing, paras 2 and 3 of MnGr10 imply that the purpose of the policy is to support economic development.</p> <p>However, Policy MnGr10 says re-use of redundant and disused buildings <u>may</u> be supported if the 5 criteria are met. This does not provide a practical framework within which planning decisions can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency.</p> <p>Paras 7 and 8 list SWDP 8 and SWDP 12 as relevant linked policies. However, the paras then seek to interpret those policies. If the Plan wishes to explain the differences between SWDP 8, SWDP 12 and MnGr10 it is suggested that this would be more appropriate in the Supporting Evidence section.</p>
<p>Policy MnGr 11 – Assets of Community Value</p> <p>Proposals that will enhance the viability and/or community value of facilities included in the register of Assets of Community Value will be supported.</p> <p>Proposals that result in either the loss of the asset or in significant harm to the community value of an asset, whether land or premises, currently or last used as a community asset will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The use no longer serves the needs of the community in which it is located; and ii. There is adequate alternative provision within the Neighbourhood Plan Area which has the capacity to meet the needs of the community which the lost use previously served; and iii. The proposed alternative use would deliver a clear community benefit; and 	<p>Policy MnGr 12 seeks to prevent the loss or change of use of the Assets of Community Value. The policy proposes that change or loss of the proposed Assets would only be supported if the use is no longer needed by the community, alternative provision is made within the parish and it can be demonstrated that the use is not financially viable.</p> <p>It should be noted that the designation of Assets of Community Value is an entirely separate process to neighbourhood planning. Neighbourhood Plans, themselves, cannot undertake designation and if something has not been designated as an Asset of Community Value, then it is not an Asset of Community Value.</p> <p>Para 3 of Policy MnGr12 proposes 10 potential Assets of Community Value. It is suggested that proposing potential Assets of Community Value may be an action for the Parish Council and that this could be addressed in the section of the Plan</p>

<p>iv. The proposed use would be compatible with adjacent land uses and not be detrimental to neighbouring properties or businesses.</p> <p>v. If a property the use is no longer financially viable long-term, as evidenced by, as a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of the realistic and appropriate marketing of the premises, leasehold and freehold for at least 12 months. • A financial appraisal that demonstrates that the re-use would not be viable within five years. 	<p>dealing with actions for the Parish Council.</p> <p>It appears that the policy is actually seeking to protect and encourage the enhancement of valued community facilities. It may have been more appropriate if the policy had related to the protection and improvement of community facilities rather than Assets of Community Value.</p>
<p>Policy MnGr 12 - Developer Contribution Policy</p> <p>All new development in the NDP area should provide necessary and appropriate infrastructure and new facilities on-site, or contribute to off-site infrastructure and facilities as required by means of planning condition, Section 106 contribution, or use of Community Infrastructure Levy as appropriate. In particular all new development which is likely to increase transportation demands, which may increase demands for vehicular, cycle and/or pedestrian flows, to which Section 106 or Community Infrastructure Levy can be applied should be required to provide a contribution towards the priorities of the Parish Council as initially noted below; but subject to subsequent amendments by the Parish Council.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various road safety and traffic calming measures as noted in policy Trf 1. • The development of a safe cycle route between Hanley Castle and Hanley Swan as noted in policy Trf 2. • The development of further footpath and cycleway connections as also noted in policy Trf 2. • Alleviating parking problems at Hanley Castle High School and adjacent to Hanley Swan Post Office as noted in PCR 6. 	<p>Policy MnGr 12 proposes that developer contributions (Section 106 contributions or CIL) contribute towards Parish Council transport priorities. The policy lists four “initial” priorities.</p> <p>It is suggested that the policy related to the spending of developer contributions would be more appropriate in the section of the Plan related to Implementation or actions for the Parish Council.</p> <p>As currently worded, the policy lacks sufficient clarity that a decision maker could apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It is suggested that some of the text in the policy would be more appropriate as supporting text.</p> <p>In relation to S106 contributions, CIL and the parishes initial priorities, the following should be noted:</p> <p>The Framework, paragraph 204 says that planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms • directly related to the development; and

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. <p>For CIL payments, where development that levies a charge occurs in the area, the items in the policy could be paid for (either in full or in part) by the Neighbourhood Planning portion generated through CIL.</p> <p>None of the parishes priorities set out in MnGr 12 are specifically set out in the South Worcestershire Council’s Regulation 123 list accompaniment table, i.e. for additional provision of CIL monies collected by the Council’s that is not passed onto the Parish Council as part of the Neighbourhood Planning portion.</p> <p>This of course does not preclude the Parish Council from seeking to implement their transport priorities (in full or in part) through their Neighbourhood Planning funding portion of the CIL (subject to consultation with the relevant shareholders / infrastructure providers).</p>
<p>Parish Council Action - PCR 1 - Community and Business Integration</p> <p>1 A member of the Parish Council is designated to liaise with businesses within the parish.</p> <p>2 Provision will be made for businesses to advertise any vacancies on the parish website.</p>	<p>Policy PCR1 proposes to designate a Parish Councillor to liaise with local businesses. The Parish Council also propose to advertise job vacancies on the parish website.</p> <p>Please see previous comments relating to wider community aspirations / actions for the Parish Council.</p>
<p>Policy RE 1 – Sympathetic Design</p> <p>Proposals for all forms of new development must plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design, at the same time demonstrating they have sought to conserve local distinctiveness and the aesthetic qualities of traditional rural settlements and buildings found in the parish. Applications proposing unsympathetic designs which fail to respect the connections between people and places, or are inappropriate</p>	<p>Policy RE 1 seeks to ensure that the design of development proposals should be of a high quality that reflects local character and reinforces local distinctiveness.</p> <p>The government is seeking to support high quality design in all new development. The thrust of the policy therefore has regard to the Framework.</p> <p>However, as currently worded, it is considered that the policy lacks sufficient</p>

<p>to their location, or pay inadequate regard to issues of renewable energy technologies, landscape and biodiversity considerations will not be supported.</p> <p>Guidance upon those specific issues aimed at maintaining the rurality of settlements is set out in the Hanley Castle Parish Building Design Guide, which should be read alongside this document.</p>	<p>clarity that a decision maker could apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications.</p> <p>The policy also appears to overlap with Policy Des 1 (General Building Design Principles). It is suggested that Policy RE 1 is deleted or integrated into Section 8 relating to Design Policies.</p> <p>Para 11 – It should be noted that the SWDP Design SPD was adopted in March 2018.</p>
<p>Policy RE 2 – Settlement Identity</p> <p>In order to maintain the separate character and identities of the two principal settlements in the parish, Hanley Castle and Hanley Swan, new housing development in the open countryside, outside the Hanley Castle and Hanley Swan development boundaries (See Policy MnGr 7) will only be considered favourably if it is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. A dwelling clearly necessary for use by rural workers including persons employed in agriculture, horticulture, forestry or a rural enterprise; or ii. Affordable housing on an exception site to meet identified local need; or iii. A replacement of an existing dwelling with established use rights and where the replacement dwelling does not exceed the original footprint by 30%. <p>Extensions to existing dwellings will be supported providing that they are subordinate to and do not dominate, the character and appearance of the original dwelling.</p> <p>Conversions or the re-use of existing buildings will be supported providing</p>	<p>Policy RE2 seeks to “safeguard” the open countryside between the settlements of Hanley Castle and Hanley Swan by strictly controlling housing development outside the development boundary. The policy provides flexibility for new development for use by rural workers, rural exception sites, replacement dwellings, house extensions and conversions.</p> <p>Paragraph 55 of the Framework says that local planning authorities (and this applies to neighbourhood plans) should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as the essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work.</p> <p>Policy RE2 provides a clear local interpretation of SWDP 2C as it relates to housing development, together with SWDP 18 and SWDP 19.</p> <p>It is noted, however, that sites 2, 4 and 7 in Policy MnGr 7 would conflict with Policy RE2 unless the existing development boundary is revised (which is proposed in Policy MnGr7).</p> <p>Policy RE2 says that development “... will only be considered favourably if it is:”. It is suggested that the wording be amended to “... will be supported if it is:”</p>

<p>there is no need for substantial reconstruction or need for large extensions.</p> <p>Development Boundaries should be safeguarded to maintain each settlement's distinct identity and character and to prevent coalescence and ribbon development.</p>	<p>In relation to conversions and the re-use of existing buildings it would be helpful to make clear that the policy does not apply to Disused or Redundant Buildings which are covered by Policy MnGr10.</p> <p>Para 4 – It is considered that para 4 is not necessary.</p>
<p>Policy RE 3 – Replacing Natural Features Lost Through Development</p> <p>Where development might have an adverse impact on significant trees, orchards, hedgerows and other natural features such as ponds, then mitigation measures should be included in the development details. This may include, for example, replanting with appropriate native species and recreation or replacement of ponds of equivalent biodiversity value. Planting species should be appropriate to the location and setting in terms of type, height, density and the need for on-going management. The development approach should demonstrate in the Design and Access Statement that it has been landscape led in order to avoid retrofitting of poor quality or token landscaping.</p>	<p>Policy RE3 proposes that where significant trees, orchards, hedgerows and other natural features are adversely affected by development that mitigation measures (eg replacement by something of equivalent value) are set out in a Design and Access Statement.</p> <p>The Framework, paragraph 109 says that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity. Paragraph 118 says that if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.</p> <p>The intention of the policy is laudable but it is considered that as currently worded the policy lacks sufficient clarity that a decision maker could apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications.</p> <p>Paras 6 to 10 – It is considered that SWDP 2, SWDP 5, SWDP 22 and SWDP 25 do not have particularly strong policy links to Policy RE3.</p>
<p>Policy BHN 1 - Protection of Buildings or Structures on the Local List of Heritage Assets (Local List)</p>	<p>Policy BHN 1 seeks to protect non-designated heritage assets. Appendix B proposes 57 non-designated heritage assets for consideration in the MHDC Local</p>

<p>Following adoption by Malvern Hills District Council, proposals requiring consent which affect a building or structure on the Local List must demonstrate how they protect or enhance the heritage asset.</p> <p>The renovation, alteration or change of use of buildings or structures identified on the local heritage list should be designed sensitively, and with careful regard to the heritage asset’s historical and architectural interest and setting.</p> <p>The Council will resist development which will involve demolition or part demolition of buildings or structures on the Local List. Applications proposing demolition will be required to demonstrate that the viability of continued beneficial use, restoration or conversion has been fully investigated and that there are no reasonable alternatives. In cases where demolition is unavoidable the Council will seek to ensure that provision is made for an appropriate level of archaeological buildings recording to take place prior to demolition.</p>	<p>List SPD.</p> <p>Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and the Framework (paragraph 17) requires that historic assets should be conserved in a manner that is appropriate to their significance.</p> <p>The policy rightly distinguishes between designated heritage assets (such as listed buildings and conservation areas) and other heritage assets (identified by the local authority).</p> <p>The aspiration to identify non-designated heritage assets through the neighbourhood plan process is appropriate. The policy rightly makes clear that the Local List will be designated and maintained by Malvern Hills District Council and proposes 57 heritage assets for consideration of Local Listing in Appendix B.</p> <p>Paras 3 to 6 and Appendix B – It is suggested that the supporting text and Appendix B should make clearer that the list of heritage assets in Appendix B is a <u>proposed</u> list of non-designated heritage assets for consideration by MHDC and that the Local List will be designated and maintained by MHDC.</p> <p>The Local List SPD (May 2015) says that local heritage assets will need to be significant with regard to at least one of the following - a significant period in the District’s history, the social history of the District or a notable example of planned or incidental planning or associated with an individual of local importance. In addition a nominated asset will need to be significant having regard to one or more of the following – age, rarity, aesthetic value, group value, evidential value, archaeological interest, designed landscape, landmark status and social / communal value. It is suggested that the supporting text could usefully include the above information.</p>
--	---

	<p>Appendix B helpfully seeks to justify the proposed assets using criteria in the Local List SPD.</p> <p>Para 12 – It is considered that para 12 is not relevant to the Local List.</p>
<p>Policy BHN 2 – The Environs of Heritage Assets</p> <p>Proposed developments or changes in the environs of or adjacent to nationally listed and local heritage listed historic buildings or structures should enhance or sustain the heritage asset, its role in contributing to a sustainable community and make a positive contribution to the local character and sense of place.</p> <p>In considering the acceptability of proposals against this Policy, the wider public benefits of the proposed scheme, in addition to localised heritage and conservation issues and the views of the community will be taken into account.</p>	<p>Policy BHN 3 seeks to protect the setting of nationally listed and locally listed heritage assets.</p> <p>Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and the Framework requires that historic assets should be conserved in a manner that is appropriate to their significance (paragraph 17).</p> <p>Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting. Section 72(1) of that Act requires decision makers to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. All development proposals relating to designated historic assets are subject to these statutory tests, which affords them a high degree of protection.</p> <p>SWDP 6 (Historic Environment) seeks to conserve and enhance heritage assets and SWDP 24 (Management of the Historic Environment) relates to the management of heritage assets, including the contribution made by their setting.</p> <p>Policy BHN 3 is less detailed and considered to be weaker in its requirements than SWDP 24. It should be noted that where there is a conflict between Neighbourhood Plan policies and those in the SWDP, Guidance says that any conflicts in policy must be resolved by the decision maker favouring the policy contained in the last document to become part of the development plan.</p>

	In light of the above, it is not clear what added value Policy BHN2 would provide.
<p>Policy BHN 3 – Protection of the Archaeological Environment</p> <p>Development proposals in areas listed below and shown on the inset map should take account of known surface and sub-surface archaeology, and 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>Known archaeological sites are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Balconies, Robert’s End, Hanley Swan – 15/16th c. kiln waste • Tara cottage, Robert’s End, Hanley Swan – 14/16th c. kiln waste • Horton Manor Farmhouse, Robert’s End, Hanley Swan – 13/17th c. pottery • Brickwalls Farm, Gilbert’s End, Hanley Castle – 13/16th c. kiln waste • Land immediately north and south of Quay Lane, Hanley Castle – Roman pottery and iron waste dating to the 2nd century. <p>These five bullet pointed sites noted above should not be taken as a definitive or exhaustive list of sites / areas of archaeological interest in the Parish/Neighbourhood Plan area.</p>	<p>Policy BHN 5 proposes that any development at 5 sites of known archaeological interest take account of known surface and sub-surface archaeology.</p> <p>The Framework (paragraph 128) 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>Map 8 helpfully shows the sites of known archaeological interest to assist applicants and decision makers.</p> <p>However, Policy BHN3 para 3 says that the 5 listed sites is not a definitive list of sites of archaeological interest in the parish. Para 3 does not provide a practical framework within which planning decisions can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency.</p> <p>Paras 3, 4, 9 and 10 also provide slightly mixed messages. Whilst paras 4 and 9 say the policy is based on up-to-date and robust evidence, paras 3 and 10 suggest that the list of known archaeological sites may be subject to change.</p>
<p>Policy BHN 4 - Preserving Ancient Trees, Woodland, Trees, Hedges</p>	<p>Policy BHN 4 seeks to protect ancient trees, or trees and hedgerows of arboricultural and amenity value.</p>

<p>Development that damages or results in the loss of ancient trees or woodland will not be permitted. Development that damages or results in the loss of trees, parkland/wood pasture, woodland and hedgerows of arboricultural and amenity value will be resisted. Additionally the establishment of new native hedges is encouraged.</p> <p>Proposals should be designed to retain such features within landscaping schemes.</p>	<p>The policy also seeks to encourage the planting of new native hedges.</p> <p>If a decision maker is to apply the policy consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications, it is suggested that the location of ancient trees, or trees and hedgerows of arboricultural and amenity value would need to be mapped.</p> <p>The penultimate sentence in para 1 suggests that “local input” could play a part in identifying trees to be protected. This would not provide a practical framework within which planning decisions can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency.</p> <p>It is considered that encouraging the establishment of new native hedges is laudable but could not be applied consistently.</p> <p>Appendix C lists significant examples of important ancient trees. To assist applicants and decision makers it would be helpful if their location was mapped.</p>
<p>Policy BHN 5 - Protected Local Green Spaces</p> <p>Protected local green spaces, as marked on the inset map, will be protected from all development types in order to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the village townscape and to offer long term recreational opportunities.</p> <p>Specifically identified areas within the parish are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hanley Swan – the village pond and surroundings • Hanley Swan – the village green (registered village green) 	<p>Policy BHN8 seeks to identify and protect 8 Local Green Spaces. The identified Local Green Spaces are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hanley Swan – the village pond and surroundings 2. Hanley Swan – the village green 3. Hanley Swan – Ewe and Lamb green 4. Hanley Swan – Sports field and play area behind village hall

- Hanley Swan – Ewe and Lamb green (registered village green)
- Hanley Swan – Sports field and play area behind village hall
- Hanley Swan – Field behind Primary School
- Hanley Castle – Playing field and tennis court area in front of High School
- Hanley Castle – The Glebe field currently used for the school playing field and cricket pitch
- Hanley Castle – The green triangle outside the Three Kings (registered village green)

5. Hanley Swan – Field behind Primary School
6. Hanley Castle – Playing field and tennis court area in front of High School
7. Hanley Castle – The Glebe field currently used for the school playing field and cricket pitch
8. Hanley Castle – The green triangle outside the Three Kings

The Framework makes provision for a neighbourhood plan to identify Local Green Spaces of particular importance to the local community. Paragraph 76 states that ‘by designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances’.

Policy BHN5 suggests that the Local Green Spaces would be protected from all development, which would go beyond what Paragraph 76 of the Framework says. It is suggested that it may be more appropriate to say that “The Local Green Spaces identified Map 10 will be protected from development except in very special circumstances.”

It is suggested that the policy is simply titled “Local Green Spaces”

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 the Framework states that such designations will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. It should only be used when the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves, where it is demonstrably special to the local community and holds a particular local significance. The allocation of each Local Green Space within the policy therefore requires robust justification.

Based on the information provided in para 9 and on Map 10 it seems to be clear

	<p>that the proposed Local Green Spaces are local to the community they serve, hold a local significance and are not extensive tracts of land.</p> <p>It is suggested that para 1 includes reference to paragraphs 76 and 77 of the Framework.</p> <p>It is suggested that as currently worded paras 1 and 2 relate to open space and green infrastructure which may not be helpful, particularly as para 77 of the Framework says that the Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green space or open space.</p> <p>The list of National and Local Policies should include reference to paragraphs 76 – 78 of the Framework. It is suggested that the national and local policies listed in paras 3 to 6 are not relevant. Further, responses to the residential questionnaire on the need to protect public green spaces and ancient trees are probably not relevant given that Local Green Space is a specific policy designation.</p>
<p>Policy BHN 6 - Sites of Biological Interest</p> <p>Development proposals that impact on local wildlife and habitats identified in the list below and shown upon the inset maps, should demonstrate how biodiversity will be protected and enhanced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Langdale and Blackmore Woods • The Lills, Common Wood, Upper Arles Wood • All the watercourses including Pool Brook and Mere Brook and their feeder streams • The pools / weirs to the right of Home Farm • The Moat adjacent to Cygnet Lodge • Water Wheel Covert and Sink Covert on Pool Brook 	<p>Policy BHN 6 seeks to protect and enhance sites of biological interest. The policy lists 10 specific sites / areas of biological interest.</p> <p>Para 13 indicates that the proposed 10 sites were identified through the Worcestershire Biological Records Centre and provides a summary of each site.</p> <p>The location of the proposed sites is helpfully identified on Map 11.</p> <p>Para 1 says that Policy BHN6 lists “some” important green sites. To provide a practical framework within which decision makers can make decisions on planning applications with confidence and certainty it is suggested that it is made clearer that the sites listed in BHN6 and shown on Map 11 are the sites to which the policy relates.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Days Coppice • River Severn • Brickpits Plantation • Cliffey Wood & Cliffs 	<p>Paras 9 and 10 list the WCC Health & Wellbeing Strategy and WSDP Health SPD as relevant National & Local Strategies. Surely, the purpose of BHN6 is to protect the wellbeing of wildlife on the sites of biological interest, not the health and wellbeing of people?</p> <p>Para 14 refers to the Malvern Hills Local Plan (2006) which has been replaced by the SWDP. Reference to the 2006 Local Plan should therefore be deleted.</p>
<p>Policy Des 1 – General Building Design Principles</p> <p>In order to be considered favourably all new development proposals will need to satisfy the following building design principles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Any development should be of a character, scale, mass and built form which responds to the characteristics of the site and its surroundings; the Design and Access Statements should clearly demonstrate how this is achieved. Care should be taken to ensure that building(s) height, scale and form, including the roofline, do not disrupt the visual amenities of the street scene and impact on any significant wider landscape views. ii. To avoid visual uniformity, proposals should not feature designs specific to a generic “scheme”. They should display, within Design and Access Statements, how the proposed individual designs take account of the locally distinctive character of the area in which they are to be sited. iii. New buildings should follow a design approach in the use of materials, fenestration and rooflines which is sympathetic to the existing built environment. Materials should be chosen to complement the design of a development and add to the quality or character of the surrounding environment. New development proposals need not imitate earlier architectural periods or styles and 	<p>Policy Des 1 sets out 6 general design guide principles for new development.</p> <p>The Government is seeking to support high quality design in all new development. The Framework (paragraph 58) says that neighbourhood plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area. Such policies should be based on an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics.</p> <p>Paragraph 59 of the Framework says that design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally.</p> <p>Paragraph 60 of the Framework says that planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.</p> <p>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.</p>

<p>could be the stimulus for the use of imaginative modern design using high quality materials in innovative ways, but they must still be sensitive to surroundings and not be excessively prominent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv. New developments, alterations or extensions especially in the parish Conservation Area should be sensitive to the local context in terms of materials, design, colour scheme, scale and structure. v. Redevelopment, alteration or extension of historic farmsteads and agricultural buildings within the parish should be sensitive to their distinctive character, materials and form. Due reference and consideration should be made to the Worcestershire Farmstead Assessment Framework; a document jointly produced by Worcestershire County Council and English Heritage.* vi. Proposals should minimise the impact on general amenity and give careful consideration to noise, odour and light. Light pollution should, wherever possible, be removed. <p>Applications which fail to address the policy criteria where opportunity exists should be refused as it is considered that they do not deliver sustainable development.</p> <p>The above criteria have been developed from the Parish Design Guide (2017) which is a supplementary guidance document to this Neighbourhood Plan and should be read alongside this policy. The Design Guide gives specific advice on the use of appropriate materials.</p> <p>* The document is available to view on the WCC website and provides a step-by-step approach to considering the reuse of traditional farm buildings and the sustainable development of farmsteads, through identifying their historic character, significance and potential for change.</p>	<p>The relationship between Policy Des 1 and Policy RE 1 is unclear. There appears to be an overlap between Des 1 and RE 1 and it is suggested that RE 1 could be deleted.</p> <p>Policy Des1, para 2 says that planning applications which do not have regard to the proposed design principles “should be refused”. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. On this basis it is inappropriate for a policy to state development will be permitted, or as in this case, will be refused. The proper basis for decision making would be made clear through use of the term “will not be supported” in recognition that the basis of decision making is the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.</p> <p>In relation to the 6 Design Principles, Des1(v) makes reference to the Worcestershire Farmstead Assessment Framework (WFAF). It is suggested that it would have been helpful to explain what the WFAF is and provide a weblink to it rather than include a reference to it in a footnote.</p> <p>It is suggested that the list of National and Local Policies should include the SWDP Design SPD which was adopted in March 2018.</p> <p>Para 13 includes reference to Appendix E which is not included in the Plan. It is also not clear what the relevance of the information in para 13 is to Design Principles.</p>
---	--

<p>Policy Des 2 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy</p> <p>With the exception of wind turbines, proposals by the community or businesses for standalone renewable and other low carbon energy schemes will be supported if their impacts are (or can be made) acceptable.</p> <p>Considerations that should be taken into account when assessing proposals include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual impact in the immediate locality and the wider area • Impact on adjoining uses including noise, vibration, or electromagnetic interference • Sites of local nature conservation • Public safety • Continued safe use of public rights of way • Highway safety and traffic generation • Impact on the Conservation Area, listed buildings or their setting • They are in accordance with the Character and Built Environment and Green Spaces policies of the Neighbourhood Plan, including the Neighbourhood Plan Design Guide <p>Proposals for installations will need to include specific assessments related to these criteria and to consider the cumulative impacts. A scheme should be agreed with the local planning authority to remove the energy generating infrastructure as soon as reasonably practicable once it is no longer used for energy generation.</p>	<p>Policy Des 2 seeks to support stand alone renewable and low carbon energy proposals (except wind turbines), subject to them meeting specified criteria.</p> <p>National guidance advises (paragraph 18) that “Neighbourhood plans are an opportunity for communities to plan for community led renewable energy developments.” As worded, Policy Des 2 would apply to all renewable and low carbon energy proposals in the parish, although the Introduction indicates that policy is intended to facilitate community-led and business schemes. It would be helpful if the policy title made it clearer that the policy applies to stand-alone renewable and low carbon energy proposals or community led proposals (and not building integrated technologies which are attached to the fabric of a building).</p> <p>In June 2015, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government set out considerations to be applied to proposed <u>wind energy</u> developments. It made clear that planning permission should only be granted if the site has been identified as suitable for wind energy development in a Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan and that the planning impacts identified by the affected local community have been fully addressed and the proposal has the local community’s backing. Policy Des 2 is consistent with the Ministerial Statement.</p> <p>SWDP 27A (Renewable and Low Carbon Energy) requires all new developments to incorporate renewable or low carbon energy equivalent to at least 10% of predicted energy requirements. SWDP 27C also supports stand-alone renewable and low carbon energy schemes (with the exception of wind turbines), subject to compliance with other relevant policies in the SWDP. The South Worcestershire Councils have prepared a Draft Renewable & Low Carbon Energy SPD which sets out detailed guidelines for assessing the suitability of stand-alone renewable and low carbon energy proposals.</p> <p>The relationship between Policy Des2 and SWDP 27 (and particularly SWDP 27C)</p>
--	---

	is currently unclear. In particular, it is not clear whether Policy Des 2 is intended to compliment or replace SWDP 27C.
<p>Policy Des 3 - Integrating New Developments with the Existing Community</p> <p>The design and layout of all new housing developments in excess of five properties must, where appropriate and practicable, ensure easy access for cyclists, pedestrians and the disabled and other users with the surrounding residential areas and facilities of the villages. This must provide safe and convenient means to link up with existing or proposed access routes, ensuring that residents can move safely to bus stops, schools and other village facilities. Where possible they should also seek to improve connectivity to existing developments.</p>	<p>Policy Des 3 says that new housing developments exceeding 5 dwellings should (where appropriate and practical) ensure connectivity for cyclists, pedestrians, the disabled and other users with the surrounding areas of the villages. The policy also says that proposals must provide safe and convenient access to bus stops, schools and other village facilities.</p> <p>The intention of Policy Des 3 appears to be to ensure that new developments are integrated with existing development, by not creating “islands of development”.</p> <p>However, it is considered that the policy is not drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker could apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications.</p> <p>It is suggested that Policy RE2 which seeks to focus new development within development boundaries and strictly control development in the open countryside could potentially achieve the objective that Policy Des 3 is seeking to achieve.</p>
<p>Policy Trf 1 - Highways and Traffic Principles</p> <p>In order to be considered favourably all new development proposals will need to satisfy the following highways and traffic principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The potential effect of additional traffic movements upon the existing environment resulting from development proposals should be reviewed at an appropriate level of detail to ensure it is sustainable in terms of infrastructure, road safety and the standards required to maintain a peaceful and safe rural parish. ii. Within new developments, traffic calming measures and 	<p>Policy Trf 1 proposes 4 “highways and traffic principles” that all proposals for new development must meet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. A review of additional traffic movements arising from development proposals. ii. Traffic calming measures to be encouraged. iii. Any new car parks to be small in scale. iv. Proposals which seek to increase the number of access points or increase

<p>landscaping designs which define settlements and influence driver behaviour will be encouraged, in accordance with the current recommended standards of Worcestershire County Council.</p> <p>iii. Any area allocated to increase public car parking space in the parish should be small in scale, subservient to the peaceful nature of the settlements and seek to limit the domination of motorised vehicles in a rural environment. Car parks are to be constructed in accordance with the current recommended standards set out by Worcestershire County Council.</p> <p>iv. Proposals that accord with the policies in the plan and result in improvements to the free flow of traffic in the village will be supported. Proposals requiring planning permission and which seek to increase the number of access points or which would involve an increase in traffic generation will need to demonstrate that they do not further inhibit the free flow of traffic or exacerbate conditions of parking stress, including conflict with larger vehicles, in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hanley Swan village, B4209, Welland Road, Worcester Road. • Hanley Castle B4211. 	<p>vehicle movements on the B4209 through Hanley Swan or the B4211 through Hanley Castle will need to demonstrate that they do not inhibit traffic flow or exacerbate parking stress</p> <p>The supporting text for Policy Trf 1 highlights existing highways and traffic issues in the parish.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plan policies should address the effect of additional traffic generated by development proposals. Given that Policy Trf 1 would apply to new development proposals, it could be made clearer that the purpose of the policy would be to minimise the traffic impact of proposed new development.</p> <p>Trf1(i) appears to be proposing that there be a review of the traffic impact arising from all development proposals. It would not be proportionate to require all planning applications for new development to be accompanied by a traffic impact assessment.</p> <p>It is not clear whether decision makers could apply Trf(i) and Trf(iv) consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications.</p>
<p>Trf 2 - Footpaths/Bridleways/Cycle paths</p> <p>Support will be given for new development which seeks to improve footpath, bridleway and cycle connections within the parish. Where it is considered viable and practicable, contributions will be sought from developments to deliver localised improvements.</p> <p>Developments may contribute by delivering new footpaths on or adjacent to their application site.</p> <p>Developments which help secure new footpath and cycle links to key</p>	<p>Policy Trf2 proposes general support for developments which improve footpath and cycle routes within the parish.</p> <p>Policy Trf2 proposes 4 priority schemes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycle route between Hanley Castle and Hanley Swan • Improved footpath between Church End and Bowling Green • Improved footpath between Hanley Swan and the Three Counties crossroads • Cycle route along Park Lane in Hanley Swan to Blackmore Park and to

<p>community facilities and between communities will be considered favourably, subject to the other policies of this NDP and the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Parish Council regards the development of a safe cycle route between Hanley Castle and Hanley Swan as a priority. In addition the following cycleway schemes will be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the footway between Church End and Bowling Green in Hanley Castle to form a link to the cycleway to Upton upon Severn • Improve the footway between Hanley Swan and the Three Counties crossroads to provide a cycleway to that destination and to potentially provide a link to the proposed Malvern to Upton cycle route. • A new cycleway along the route of Park Lane in Hanley Swan to the Blackmore Park industrial / commercial development and out to Blackmore Park Road B4208. <p>The Parish Council will work with Sustrans and the Highway Authority to develop the network of cycle routes within the parish and to link these to other local or national cycle routes where appropriate. Funds arising from S106 and / or CIL will be applied to help fund the developments as set out in the Developer Contribution Policy MnGr 12.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Blackmore Park Road</p> <p>The proposed cycle routes are shown on Map 12.</p> <p>Policy Trf 2 proposes that the Parish Council will liaise with Sustrans and the County Council to develop a network of cycle routes and that S106 / CIL moneys will be used to fund the schemes.</p> <p>The proposed priority schemes clearly seek to improve connectivity and encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>The Policy says that the Parish Council propose to work with the County Council and Sustrans to develop the network of cycle routes. It is considered that these tasks would be more appropriately included in the section within the Plan dealing with actions for the Parish Council.</p> <p>In relation to S106 contributions and CIL please see earlier comments relating to Policy MnGr 12.</p> <p>It is considered that some of the National and Local Policies and Supporting Evidence that are listed (particularly paras 18, 22 and 23) are not directly relevant to Policy Trf2.</p>
<p>PCR 2 - Traffic Calming and Highway Safety</p> <p>The NDP is committed to the improvement of highway safety within the parish. A number of measures will be put in place to address highways issues within and around the parish including the introduction of appropriate traffic calming features within the villages to slow down the speed of vehicles passing through. This will not include 'speed bumps'.</p>	<p>Policy PCR2 says that the Parish Council will liaise with the District and County Councils to address highways issues in the parish. The policy also proposes 8 initial "priority" schemes for funding under S106 contributions and CIL.</p> <p>In relation to paragraph 2 it should be noted that MHDC has not considered or agreed to work with the Parish Council and Highways Authority on the issues proposed.</p>

<p>The Parish Council and District and County Councillors will work closely with the Highways Authority to ensure that the features introduced are appropriate in both highways and conservation terms. Schemes around the school, key junctions and at ‘gateways’ (entrance points to villages) should receive priority funding, including the use of monies from S106 agreements and CIL as set out in the Developer Contribution Policy MnGr 12.</p> <p>Priority schemes will include but not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking and traffic movement around Hanley Castle High School • Speed reduction and parking around Hanley Swan Primary School • Safety improvements at Cross Hands junction of the B4209 and B4211 • Parking improvements at the Welland Road / B4209 junction • Speed reduction through Hanley Castle along the B4211 • Safety improvements at the Rhydd junction of the B4211 and B4424 to Malvern. (This is adjacent to the Parish boundary.) • Speed reduction through Hanley Swan along the B4209, B4208, Worcester Road and Welland Road. • The provision of safe road crossings for pedestrians. 	<p>The supporting text does not provide a robust, proportionate, evidence to justify the priority schemes suggested. The list is considered to be aspirational.</p> <p>In relation to S106 contributions and CIL please see earlier comments relating to Policy MnGr 12.</p> <p>Please see previous comments in relation to actions for the Parish Council.</p>
<p>PCR 3 – Public Realm</p> <p>New and replacement street furniture and signage should be practical, of modest scale and in keeping with local surroundings. Street furniture, signage and other public realm changes within the conservation area should follow the principles outlined in the Conservation Areas Character Appraisals. Similarly such changes impacting upon nationally listed or local heritage listed historic buildings or structures should enhance and not</p>	<p>Policy PCR 3 says that street furniture and signage should be in keeping with local surroundings. Policy PCR3 says that the Parish Council will liaise with the County Council to achieve this.</p> <p>Please see previous comments in relation to actions for the Parish Council.</p>

<p>detract from the setting of those buildings and structures. The Parish Council will work in conjunction with Worcestershire County Council in achieving these aims.</p>	
<p>Policy PCR 4 - Three Counties Showground Traffic Flows</p> <p>The parish will continue to actively work with the TCAS to manage traffic flows and to encourage them to take on responsibility for the management of traffic flows and provision of sustainable transport for all events at the showground.</p>	<p>Policy PCR 4 says that the Parish Council will continue to work with the Three Counties Agricultural Society (TCAS) to manage traffic flows and provision of sustainable transport at the Three Counties Showground.</p> <p>Please see previous comments in relation to actions for the Parish Council.</p>
<p>PCR 5 – Beneficial Highways Developments</p> <p>The Parish Council will also make representations to MHDC that the Developer Contribution Policy MnGr 13 will also be applied where possible to developments outside the NDP area which would have impacts on the highways in Hanley Castle Parish. This could apply, for example to developments at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A4104 junction with A38 • B4209 / B4211 junction at Hanley Castle • The vicinity of the Three Counties Showground 	<p>Policy PCR 5 says the Parish Council will encourage MHDC to use developer contributions to fund highways schemes outside the parish that could improve traffic flows within the parish.</p> <p>Policy PCR 5 relates to the aspirations of the local community to address the effects of existing traffic movements. They do not specifically relate to dealing with the effect of additional traffic generated by development proposals.</p> <p>In relation to proposing transport schemes outside the Neighbourhood Area, this would fall outside the remit of the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>In relation to S106 contributions and CIL please see earlier comments relating to Policy MnGr 12.</p> <p>Please see previous comments in relation to actions for the Parish Council.</p>
<p>PCR 6 - Parking Problems</p> <p>The parish will work with the management of Hanley Castle High School to achieve satisfactory short and long term solutions to the problems</p>	<p>Policy PCR 6 says the Parish Council will liaise with Hanley Castle High School, Hanley Swan village shop and the Highways Authority with a view to identifying solutions to existing car parking issues in the parish.</p>

<p>caused by parents parking inconsiderately when collecting their children. An extension to the existing bus bay would be supported.</p> <p>The parish will work with the owners of the Hanley Swan village shop and with the Highways authority to alleviate parking problems around the crossroads junction.</p> <p>In both cases S106 or CIL funding may be used to provide a solution as set out in the Developer Contribution Policy MnGr 12.</p>	<p>In relation to S106 contributions and CIL please see earlier comments relating to Policy MnGr 12.</p> <p>Please see previous comments in relation to actions for the Parish Council.</p>
<p>PCR 7 - Bus Services</p> <p>The Parish Council recognises the importance to many parishioners of the provision of adequate and convenient public bus services. We will continue to work closely with the County Council and their contracted service providers to ensure services within the parish continue to be provided at a reasonable cost and frequency for links to key destinations with an improved level of infrastructure e.g. associated footpaths.</p> <p>The provision of school buses is important for the safety of children but also helps reduce unnecessary car journeys. The Parish Council will liaise with the County Council to ensure the provision of school buses matches the needs of pupils and students to their place of education</p>	<p>Policy PCR 7 says the Parish Council will liaise with the County Council with a view to maintaining or improving public and school bus services.</p> <p>Please see previous comments in relation to actions for the Parish Council.</p>
<p>Section 10: Implementation of Parish Council Responsibilities</p>	<p>Section 10 of the Neighbourhood Plan sets out proposed actions by Hanley Castle Parish Council and partners to help deliver the objectives and planning policies of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>It is suggested that the actions for the Parish Council be transferred into an Appendix or be developed into a separate implementation plan.</p>

	<p>It is suggested that Section 10 could usefully outline the next steps, explain how the neighbourhood plan policies will be implemented, together with arrangements for monitoring and review of the Plan. It is suggested that wording along the following lines may be appropriate:</p> <p><i>“If the examiner recommends that the Plan should proceed to referendum, Malvern Hills District Council will arrange a referendum, and if more than 50% of those voting, vote in favour then the Plan will be made (brought into force).</i></p> <p><i>The Neighbourhood Plan would then be part of the statutory development plan for Hanley Castle and would be used to help determine planning applications in the parish.</i></p> <p><i>Hanley Castle Parish Council will regularly monitor the implementation of the Neighbourhood Plan. When new issues are identified, policies are found to be out of date or in need of change (for example due to changing national or strategic planning policy), the Parish Council in consultation with Malvern Hills District Council may decide to update the all or part of the plan.”</i></p>
Section 11: Glossary	Where the same terms are also defined in the Framework or the SWDP it is suggested that these definitions are used to ensure consistency.
Acknowledgements	
Appendix A – Listed Structures	
Appendix B – Local Heritage List	<p>It is suggested that the Appendix be re-titled Heritage Assets Proposed For Local Listing.</p> <p>It is also suggested that the introductory text say that the Local List will be</p>

	designated and maintained by Malvern Hills District Council and that the heritage assets listed in the Appendix have been identified by Hanley Castle Parish Council for consideration as potential inclusions on the Local List.
Appendix C – Most Important Ancient Trees	
Supporting Document (Separate)	It is noted that the “supporting document” is actually 2 documents, part one (Results of the 2014 Residential Questionnaire) and part two (other background evidence).