

**Hallow Neighbourhood Development Plan**  
**Regulation 16 Consultation**  
**Malvern Hills District Council Officer Comments**  
**February 2021**

**General Comments**

As a context for our comments, the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (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 Hallow Neighbourhood Area is provided by the South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP) which was adopted in February 2016. The SWDP covers the administrative areas of Malvern Hills District Council, Worcester City Council and Wychavon District Council and was developed by the South Worcestershire Councils (SWC).

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 SWDPR Preferred Options between November and December 2019, including a proposed housing allocation in Hallow at land south of Tinkers Coppice Farm (site reference CFS0343sc).

Planning Practice Guidance says that if a local planning authority is also intending to allocate sites in the same neighbourhood area it should avoid duplicating planning processes that will apply to the neighbourhood area. PPG says that a local planning authority should share evidence with those preparing the neighbourhood plan, in order for example, that every effort can be made to meet identified local need through the neighbourhood planning process. PPG says that a neighbourhood plan can also propose allocating alternative sites to those in a

local plan, where alternative proposals for inclusion in the neighbourhood plan are not strategic, but a qualifying body should discuss with the local planning authority why it considers the allocations set out in the strategic policies are no longer appropriate.

Following public consultation undertaken by the Parish Council in Hallow, the Parish Council requested in December 2019 that the proposed SWDPR allocation be replaced by an alternative site - an extension to an existing site south of Greenhill Lane (site reference CFS0136). The reasons for proposing site CFS0136 as an alternative to site CFS0343sc include:

- i. The land at Greenhill Lane is considered to form a natural extension to an existing SWDP allocation south of Greenhill Lane, would confine further new development to this area, and would utilise an existing access point on to the Main Road at Hallow.
- ii. The reason that the Greenhill Lane extension was not chosen as the preferred option in the SWDPR was due to concerns about the proximity of a gas pipeline. These concerns have been investigated and addressed by the Parish Council, including a statement from the Health & Safety Executive setting out the required buffer zone for the pipeline and information from CADENT gas.
- iii. Residents attending 5 public consultation events in Hallow in Autumn 2019 indicated a preference for site CFS0136 compared with site CFS0343sc because it would preserve the last green space along Main Road (Tinkers Coppice) and avoid the need for an additional access road onto the busy Main Road (the A443).
- iv. Site CFS0136 would avoid the partial use of a large site at the northern end of the village.
- v. Site CFS0136 could meet the housing requirement for Hallow Neighbourhood Area.

In light of the evidence provided by the Parish Council, and guidance in PPG which discourages duplicating planning processes and allows qualifying bodies to allocate alternative sites, the SWC agreed in principle to support the allocation of site CFS0136 as an alternative to CFS0343sc.

The working relationship between the SWC and Hallow Parish Council in relation to allocating sites for residential development in the Hallow Neighbourhood Plan is set out in a Memorandum of Understanding between the parties.

Whilst paragraph 69 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 Hallow Parish Council, the SWC provided indicative housing requirement figures for the Hallow neighbourhood area in July 2019. 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 21 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 development strategy in the adopted SWDP rather than the emerging SWDPR.

It is considered that the proposed allocation of land at Green Hill Lane for a minimum of 40 dwellings would meet the indicative housing requirement in full. The District Council would like to congratulate the Parish Council for taking a proactive approach towards meeting the indicative housing requirement through the neighbourhood planning process.

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”.

As a general comment, it is considered that some policies are not currently drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker could apply them consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. In particular, it is considered that the wording of Policies HAL4 (Landscape) and HAL8 (Green Infrastructure) could be made clearer. Where possible, District Council officers have suggested alternative wording for some policies to add clarity.

Apart from Policy HAL1 (proposed land at Green Hill Lane) it is considered that the draft Neighbourhood Plan does not provide a strong steer about where the development of housing or employment would be appropriate in Hallow. Whilst this is addressed in strategic policies in the SWDP and is not considered necessary to meet the Basic Conditions, it could be a missed opportunity. Economic development officers at the District Council are aware, for example, of several small businesses which first established in Hallow, which have subsequently grown and relocated outside of the area.

It is also considered that some policies would benefit from better drawing on the local evidence. For example, Policy HAL14 (Archaeological Assets) refers to information in the Historic Environment Record Search but the policy does not draw this information together to steer development away from inappropriate locations.

For ease of reference for applicants and decision makers it is suggested that the Policies Map be included in the main body of the Neighbourhood Plan.

## Cover and Neighbourhood Area Map

### 1. Introduction and Background

Paragraph 1.1 – It is considered that the final sentence will be redundant following examination of the NDP.

Paragraphs 1.4 and 1.6 will need to be updated / amended as the Neighbourhood Plan progresses through the NDP stages

### 2. Parish Portrait and Key Issues

Paragraph 2.22 refers to maps of protected and notable species on Maps 10, 11 and 15 – 17. Map 17, however, relates to community facilities and local shops.

### 3. Planning Policy Context

Paragraph 3.9 – It may be appropriate to provide a link to the District Council’s webpage for the Hallow NDP -

	<a href="https://www.malvern hills.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/neighbourhood-planning/hallow-neighbourhood-plan">https://www.malvern hills.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/neighbourhood-planning/hallow-neighbourhood-plan</a>
<b>4. Hallow Vision and Objectives</b>	
<b>5. Hallow Neighbourhood Development Plan Policies</b>	
	<p>Paragraph 5.1 refers to a Policies Map that accompanies the written document. To provide greater clarity so that a decision maker can apply the policies consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications it is suggested that the Policies Map is incorporated into the body of the Plan.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.2 – It is considered that the final sentence is slightly mis-leading and unnecessary and should be deleted.</p>
<b>6. Housing</b>	
<p><b>Policy HAL1 – Development of Land at Greenhill Lane</b></p> <p>The following site is allocated to meet housing requirements to 2041:</p> <p>HAL1/1 - Land at Green Hill Lane, Hallow (2.23 hectares gross, minimum 40 dwellings)</p> <p>Development of HAL1/1 will have to take account of the following:</p> <p>a) access should be via 2016 SWDP allocation SWDP59zzi.</p>	<p><b>Policy HAL1 – New Housing Development in Hallow Village 2021-2041</b></p> <p>Policy HAL1 proposes the allocation of a 2.23 hectare site at Green Hill Lane, Hallow for a minimum of 40 dwellings.</p> <p>The allocation would be subject to the following 3 conditions:</p> <p>a) Access to be via SWDP site allocation SWDP59zzi;</p>

<p>b) the need to provide an easement/buffer strip to separate the development from the gas pipeline to the south of the site; and</p> <p>c) the development should include a connection, or the potential to connect to the Broadheath Hallow Cycle Loop.</p>	<p>b) Easement/buffer to the gas pipeline to be provided on the south of the site; and</p> <p>c) The development should provide a dedicated cycle path.</p> <p>Paragraph 69 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.</p> <p>It is considered that the location of the proposed site at Land at Green Hill Lane conforms with SWDP2 (Development Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy). Initial concerns from the South Worcestershire Councils regarding the proximity of the site to a gas pipeline have been satisfied by evidence provided by the Parish Council in correspondence from Cadent and the Health &amp; Safety Executive.</p> <p>The site is capable of accommodating the minimum indicative housing requirement figures for the Hallow neighbourhood area provided by the South Worcestershire Councils to the Parish Council in July 2019.</p> <p>There does not currently appear to be a clear justification for condition (c) relating to the requirement for the site to provide part of a dedicated cycle path.</p> <p>Given that Policy HAL 1 relates specifically to the proposed allocation at Green Hill Lane, it is considered some of the information in the Reasoned Justification is either unnecessary or slightly misleading:</p>
--	---

- Paragraphs 6.5 & 6.6 – Reference to the “recently completed” SWDPR Preferred Options consultation in paragraph 6.5 is historic and will become out-of-date. Similarly, reference to the “emerging” indicative housing requirement in paragraph 6.6.
- Paragraph 6.7 – The final sentence relates to future reviews of the SWDP and NDP and are not relevant to Policy HAL1. It is suggested that this sentence be deleted.
- Paragraphs 6.8 to 6.10 – The Indicative Housing Requirement figures were prepared by officers from the South Worcestershire Councils (not Joint Advisory Panel). Reference to “At present ..” and details of the methodology in paragraph 6.9 will quickly become out-of-date. For accuracy and relevance it is suggested that paragraphs 6.8 to 6.10 could be replaced with “Following a request from the Parish Council, the South Worcestershire Councils prepared indicative housing requirement figures for Hallow in July 2019 in accordance with paragraph 66 of the Framework. The indicative figures, which should be regarded as a minimum, and may change in the SWDPR, indicate a housing requirement of 1 dwelling in the period 20201 – 2030 and a further 21 dwellings in the period 2031 – 2041.”
- Paragraph 6.11 - It is misleading to say that “.. leaving theoretically no dwellings to find up to 2041” The indicative housing requirements are “indicative”, may be subject to change and are minimum requirements. It is therefore suggested that the above wording is deleted.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Paragraph 6.12 – Final sentence should be amended to read “... cannot be guaranteed that <b>no</b> other site ...”</li><li>• Table 4 – the relevance of past planning applications, commitments and completions in justifying the allocation of land at Green Hill Lane allocation is unclear.</li><li>• Map 7 – Policy HAL1 relates to the allocation of land at Green Hill Lane. It is considered that the proposed allocation of the site at Tinkers Coppice Farm in the SWDPR has been overtaken by events in light of the MoU between the SWCs and the Parish Council and that showing the Tinkers Coppice site on Map 7 is unnecessary and unhelpful to the NDP.</li><li>• Paragraph 6.14, bullet point 1 – As a matter of accuracy, the MoU does not say that land at Greenhill Lane will identified in the SWDPR. Rather, the MoU says that the SWC’s will “Not allocate sites for housing in the Neighbourhood Area through the SWDPR if the Parish Council can demonstrate that it can meet the housing requirement for Hallow through the neighbourhood planning process.”</li><li>• Paragraph 6.14, bullet point 2, final sentence – allocating land at Green Hill Lane because it is outside the Significant Gap is not a planning reason for allocating the site. It is suggested that the final sentence be deleted.</li><li>• Paragraph 6.14, bullet point 6 – the justification for the requirement for the site to connect to the Broadheath Hallow Cycle Loop does not seem clear.</li></ul>
--	---

<p><b>Policy HAL2 – Housing Need</b></p> <p>To be supported, all new housing development proposals of 5 or more units (subject to viability considerations) must demonstrate that they provide a range of types, sizes, and tenures of housing to meet local housing need. Within the Neighbourhood Area there is a particular need for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordable housing (particularly 1-bedroom social rented units)</li> <li>• Affordable and open market 1- and 2-bedroom homes (e.g., starter homes for young people or homes for older people wishing to downsize)</li> <li>• Bungalows of different tenures</li> </ul> <p>When preparing planning applications that need to include a mix of housing on a site, applicants should take account of, and demonstrate how their proposal meets the needs identified in the most up-to-date, local Housing Needs Assessment/Strategic Housing Market Assessment.</p> <p>Or where such assessments are considered to be out of date applicants should carry out and provide their own assessment of existing local housing needs and how their proposal will meet such needs.</p>	<p><b>Policy HAL2 – Housing Needs</b></p> <p>Policy HAL 2 proposes that all new residential development proposals of 5 or more units provide a mix of types, sizes and tenures of housing.</p> <p>The precise mix of housing to be assessed on a “site by site” basis, taking account of the most up-to-date information available on local housing needs or the applicants own assessment of local housing needs.</p> <p>Policy HAL1 indicates that there is currently a particular need for affordable housing, for 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings for those seeking their first home and those looking to downsize, and for bungalows.</p> <p><a href="#">Policy HAL2 seeks to have regard to paragraph 61 of the Framework.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Paragraph 6.16 of the Reasoned Justification suggests that the site allocation at Green Hill Lane (Policy HAL1) will provide a range of housing types to meet local need, but this is not clear from the conditions attached to Policy HAL1.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Policy MWH1 is broadly consistent with SWDP 14 (Market Housing Mix).</a></p>
<p><b>Policy HAL3 – Housing Design</b></p> <p>New development should be informed by and retain and enhance the defining characteristics of the area of Hallow, Shoulton, Little Eastbury/Parkfield and the surrounding countryside in which it is</p>	<p><b>Policy HAL8 – Design</b></p> <p>Policy HAL8 has 2 parts:</p> <p>Part 1 of HAL8 proposes that all development proposals should demonstrate that the design has regard to the Hallow Design Guide</p>

situated. In identifying these characteristics applicants should use the Hallow Design Guide and other relevant studies e.g., those relating to landscape and heritage.

Applicants will be expected to demonstrate how a development proposal has taken account of, and been designed to incorporate, the recommended approach for each design element (e.g., windows, materials, boundary treatments, landscaping etc.) as set out in the Hallow Design Guide. This does not preclude innovative or contemporary design, where such design can be shown to respond to and provide a contemporary design solution that complements and reinforces local character.

Where relevant, development proposals should have a positive impact on the health and well-being of those living in, working in, otherwise using, or affected in other ways by the proposal. In this regard proposals should:

- a) enhance neighbourhood attractiveness, layout, and design.
- b) provide opportunities for physical activity, active travel (walking, cycling, use of public transport).

(and other unspecified relevant studies), including the design for windows, materials, boundary treatments and landscaping.

Part 2 of HAL8 proposes that, where relevant, development proposals should have a positive impact on health and well-being and should:

- a) enhance neighbourhood attractiveness, layout and design;
- b) provide opportunities for physical activity, active travel (walking, cycling, use of public transport);
- c) produce buildings and places that are accessible to all, but pay special attention to the needs of people with disabilities, older people, children and those with children; and
- d) create healthy, safe, physically and visually attractive environments that promote social interaction, physical activity and opportunities for food growing.

The Government is seeking to support high quality design in all new development. Paragraph 124 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 125 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

- c) produce buildings and places that are accessible to all, but pay special attention to the needs of people with disabilities, older people, children, and those with children; and
- d) should create healthy, safe, physically, and visually attractive environments that promote social interaction, physical activity and opportunities for food growing.

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 126 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 where this would be justified.

Paragraph 131 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 Part 1 of Policy HAL8 appears to be consistent with the Framework and SWDP 21. It is noted, however, that the focus of Policy HAL3 and associated Figure 3 seems to be on the

	<p>appearance of development with little reference to the sustainability of buildings.</p> <p>Part 2 of Policy HAL8 sets out 4 requirements that should be part of all development proposals so that they have a positive effect on health and well-being. The principle of Part 2 of the policy is laudable but it is considered that Part 2 could not be applied consistently and with confidence by decision makers. The opportunities for incorporating the proposed requirements in Part 2 are likely to be different for a single dwelling or extension compared to a larger development or group of new dwellings. If the threshold for submission of Design and Access Statements triggers where Part 2 of HAL3 becomes “relevant” then this should be made clear so that it can be applied consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. As background, the SWDP Design SPD says Design and Access Statements are only required with regard to residential development where the number of dwellings is in excess of 10, the site area is 0.5ha or above. In other types of development where the floor space is 1,000 square metres or more, or the site area is 1ha or above.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.28 refers to the Hallow Design Guide (Figure 7). It is considered that there needs to be clarity about whether applicants must demonstrate whether their proposals should respond to the elements of the Design Guide shown in Figure 7 or to the full Hallow Design Guide prepared by AECOM.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.29 refers to a report titled “Living with Beauty” produced by the building Better, Building Beautiful Commission. It is not clear</p>
--	---

	<p>what the relevance of this document is to Policy HAL3. It is suggested that this paragraph should be deleted.</p>
<p><b>6. Natural Environment and Rural Character</b></p>	
<p><b>Policy HAL4 – Landscape</b></p> <p>New development should be designed so that it protects or enhances the local landscape. Where appropriate and relevant, development proposals should be able to demonstrate (through submitted statements and studies) how they have taken into account the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Impact on the form, pattern, relationship, and character of the neighbourhood area’s separate and distinct settlements.</li> <li>b) Respect for field systems and other historic boundaries.</li> <li>c) The relationship of buildings to key features in the landscape, such as, but not limited to, routeways, hedgerows, trees, water features and watercourses; and</li> <li>d) Where landscaping is used, new planting (e.g., of trees, hedgerows, and other vegetation) should be of native species, compatible with the surrounding landscape. Where considered necessary (e.g., larger areas of landscaping or publicly accessible landscaping areas) such proposals should be accompanied by a plan setting out proposals for their long-term management and maintenance.</li> </ul> <p>New development, where relevant, should also be informed by Worcestershire County Council’s Landscape Character Assessment Supplementary Guidance and those sections of the Hallow Design Guide dealing with landscape matters. For proposals requiring a</p>	<p><b>Policy HAL4 – Landscape</b></p> <p>Policy HAL1 supports development that is designed so that it protects or enhances the local landscape.</p> <p>“Where appropriate and relevant” planning applicants are required to submit statements and studies demonstrating how their development proposal has taken account of the following 4 criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Impact on the form, relationship, pattern and character of the neighbourhood areas different settlements;</li> <li>b) Respect for field systems and other historic boundaries;</li> <li>c) Whether buildings take account of key features in the landscape (e.g. routeways, hedgerows, trees, water features and watercourses);</li> <li>d) Newly planted trees, hedgerows or vegetation to be of native species and compatible with the surrounding landscape. “Where considered necessary” landscaping proposals to include details for their long-term management and maintenance; and</li> </ul> <p>New development, “where relevant”, to be informed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Hallow Design Guide (2019); and</li> </ul>

<p>Design and Access Statement such statements should set out how the proposal has taken into account and responded to this and other relevant planning guidance.</p>	<p>b) Worcestershire County Council’s Landscape Character Assessment Supplementary Guidance.</p> <p>Design and Access Statements (where required) to set out how the development proposal has taken account of the Hallow Design Guide and WCC LCA Supplementary Guidance.</p> <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>In relation to HAL3(d), advice from the District Council’s Landscape Officer indicates that there are places where native species might not always be the best choices and more exotic choices may be more appropriate.</p> <p>Paragraphs 7.4 – 7.10 suggest that Policy HAL4 has been informed by Natural England’s “National Character Areas for England”, Natural England’s “Statements of Environmental Opportunity”, and Worcestershire County Council’s Landscape Character Assessment. The reasoned justification includes maps of key woodland habitats and ancient tree records (and other notable trees identified by parishioners), but it is not clear how this evidence has supported the approach taken in Policy HAL4 or how it is to be used in the application of the Policy.</p> <p>It is considered that the intention of Policy HAL4 is laudable but it is not clear where or what types / sizes of development the policy should be applied to – the first part HAL4 says it should be applied “where appropriate and relevant” and the second part “where relevant”. It is therefore not clear to applicants whether Policy HAL4 would apply to their development proposals and it is not clear how an applicant should demonstrate that their development proposal meets the 4 criteria.</p>
---	---

	<p>It is considered Policy HAL4 is confusing and it is not evident how an applicant should approach meeting the requirements of the policy or how a decision maker should react to a development proposal in accordance with paragraph 16 of the Framework. In light of the above, it is suggested that Policy HAL4 needs to be simplified.</p> <p>It is suggested that a Landscape Character policy along the following lines may be more appropriate, based on the County Council’s Landscape Character Assessment (summarised in paragraphs 7.7 – 7.10) and shown on Map 11:</p> <p><i>“Development proposals must demonstrate that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>a) the characteristics and guidelines for the Landscape Type of the proposed site, as defined in the Worcestershire Landscape Assessment, have positively influenced the siting, design, scale, layout, landscaping and boundary treatment of the proposal; and</i></li> <li><i>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.”</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Policy HAL5 – Dark Skies</b></p> <p>To minimise light pollution and improve views of the night-time sky, planning proposals that include external lighting will have to demonstrate the following:</p>	<p><b>Policy HAL5 – Dark Skies</b></p> <p>Policy HAL5 has 2 parts.</p> <p>Part 1 of Policy HAL5 requires any planning proposals that include external lighting to meet the following conditions:</p>

<p>a) They have undertaken an assessment of the level of obtrusive light that would be created and can demonstrate a need (e.g., for reasons of health or safety) for the level of external artificial lighting proposed; and</p> <p>b) That if the level of external lighting proposed is considered necessary, such lighting is limited in number, uses design features (e.g., siting, position, shielding, lighting technology and systems) that are designed to reduce any identified obtrusive lighting nuisance to a minimum.</p> <p>Where buildings form part of new development light spill should also be reduced to a minimum by sensitively locating and orientating buildings within a site and by avoiding large areas of permanently exposed glazing.</p>	<p>a) Undertake an assessment of the level of “obtrusive light” that would be created and the need for external lighting; and</p> <p>b) That such lighting is limited in number and designed to minimise “obtrusive lighting nuisance”.</p> <p>Part 2 of Policy proposes buildings that form part of new development should be sensitively located and orientated and should avoid large areas of exposed glazing to minimise light spill.</p> <p>Paragraph 180c 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 55 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 proposal that all planning proposals involving external artificial lighting undertake an assessment of the level of obtrusive light may be considered excessive. It is suggested that a policy along the following lines may be more appropriate – “<i>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.</i>”</p> <p>It is considered that Part 2 of Policy HAL5 would be more appropriately addressed in the Hallow Design Guide.</p>
<p><b>Policy HAL6 – Local Green Spaces</b></p>	<p><b>Policy HAL6 – Local Green Spaces</b></p>

<p>The Local Green Spaces listed below and shown on the Policies Map and Map 12 will be protected.</p> <p>HAL6/1 – Tinkers Coppice Wood</p> <p>HAL6/2 – Gravel pit HAL6/3 – Old Churchyard HAL6/4 – Village Green</p> <p>HAL6/5 – Greenhill Fishing Ponds</p> <p>HAL6/6 – Woodland, east of Church Lane</p> <p>Where development of Local Green Spaces is proposed it must be consistent with national planning policy for Green Belt.</p>	<p>Policy HAL6 proposes the designation of 6 Local Green Spaces (identified on the Proposals Map) on which any development must be consistent with national Green Belt policy.</p> <p>The proposed Local Green Spaces are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Tinkers Coppice Wood</li> <li>2. Gravel pit</li> <li>3. Old Churchyard</li> <li>4. Village Green</li> <li>5. Greenhill Fishing Ponds</li> <li>6. Woodland, east of Church Lane</li> </ol> <p>The Framework makes provision for a Neighbourhood Plan to identify Local Green Spaces of particular importance to the local community. Paragraph 99 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 100 of the Framework says that such designations 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, is local in character and not an extensive tract of land.</p>
--	--

	<p>The allocation of each Local Green Space requires robust justification. Table 7 on pages 68 – 69 of the draft Plan provides an assessment of the proposed 6 Local Green Spaces against the criteria in paragraph 100 of the Framework.</p> <p>The heading for Table 7 includes a “note” regarding reference numbers which relate to the original LGS assessment. It is suggested that this is unnecessary and may be confusing in the made NDP.</p> <p>Map 12 shows the location of the 6 proposed Local Green Spaces. It is considered that the scale of Map 13 is too small to clearly identify the boundary of sites 3 and 4. It is suggested that the map includes more detailed insets so that the boundaries of the Local Green Spaces are clear.</p> <p>Whilst paragraph 101 of the Framework says that policies for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with those for Green Belts, it is considered that it would be more appropriate for the policy to say “Development on the <i>Local Green Spaces will not be supported except in very special circumstances.</i>”</p>
<p><b>Policy HAL7 – Important Views</b></p> <p>To be supported development proposals must demonstrate that they are sited, designed and of a scale such that they do not substantially harm the important views (identified in Appendix 2 and in Table 8) when seen from locations that are freely accessible to members of the general public.</p>	<p><b>Policy HAL7 – Important Views</b></p> <p>Policy HAL7 identifies 23 important views from locations freely accessible to the general public (listed on Table 8 on pages 69 and 70 and set out in Appendix 2 on pages 122 to 146).</p> <p>Policy HAL7 seeks to ensure that development proposals are sited, designed and of a scale such that they do not substantially harm the</p>

23 views and, where necessary, requires planning applicants to submit a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA).

Paragraph 170 of the Framework says that the planning system should protect and enhance valued landscapes.

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).

To provide a practical framework for decision makers (and applicants) it would be helpful if the location of the important views was identified on a single map in the NDP. It is noted that the Policies Map (which is a freestanding document) shows the location of the important views but it would be helpful to applicants and decision makers if it was included within the NDP.

In terms of general conformity with strategic policies in the Local Plan, it should be noted that Policy SWDP 25 requires development proposals to take account of the latest Landscape Character Assessment and only requires a Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) or similar for major development proposals which are likely to have a detrimental impact on a significant landscape attribute or irreplaceable landscape feature.

The emerging SWDPR29 (Landscape Character) proposes that a LVIA will be required for major development proposals and other proposals (outside defined development boundaries) where they are likely to have a detrimental impact on the landscape as a resource and / or views and visual amenity.

<p><b>Policy HAL8 – Green Infrastructure</b></p> <p>Development proposals that impact on Hallow’s Green Infrastructure Network (shown on the Policies Map and Map 13) should demonstrate how new development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Maintains Hallow’s green infrastructure network, including key features such as the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Ecological, historic and landscape character functions of natural habitats.</li> <li>ii. Drainage and ecological value of the network of watercourses and features; and</li> <li>iii. The recreational function of existing publicly accessible green space, including footpaths, bridleways, public rights of way.</li> </ul> </li> <li>b) Responds to opportunities to incorporate new green infrastructure provision and/or restore existing green infrastructure that would otherwise be lost, as part of development proposals.</li> </ul> <p>Consideration should also be given to the incorporation of connections and links to the surrounding network of existing green infrastructure, where relevant.</p> <p>Development that would disrupt or sever the existing green infrastructure network will not be supported.</p>	<p><b>Policy HAL8 – Green Infrastructure</b></p> <p>Policy HAL8 has 4 parts:</p> <p>Part 1 of Policy HAL8 identifies land on Map 13 as Green Infrastructure (GI).</p> <p>Part 1a of HAL8 proposes that development proposals that impact on Hallow’s GI Network should demonstrate how their development proposal maintains the GI (including ecological, historic and landscape character functions of natural habitats; drainage and ecological value of the network of watercourses and features; and recreational function of existing publicly accessible green space).</p> <p>Part 1b of HAL8 requires development proposals to demonstrate how they respond to opportunities to incorporate new GI or restore existing GI that would be lost.</p> <p>Part 2 of HAL8 proposes that proposals for development should consider the incorporation of connections and links to the existing GI network.</p> <p>Part 3 of Policy HAL8 says that development proposals that would disrupt or sever the existing GI network (presumably land identified on Map 13?) would not be supported.</p> <p>Part 4 of Policy HAL8 relates to the management of new green infrastructure and says that any development proposal which would create new GI should be accompanied by a management plan setting out how the green infrastructure will be managed and maintained.</p>
---	--

<p>Where new green infrastructure is created as part of a development proposal this should be accompanied by a management plan (secured by a condition) setting out how the resource will be managed and maintained.</p>	<p>Green Infrastructure (GI) is defined in the Framework as a network of multi-functional green space, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits for local communities.</p> <p>Paragraph 20 of the Framework says that <b>strategic policies</b> should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development, and make sufficient provision for, amongst other things, green infrastructure.</p> <p>Paragraph 171 of the Framework says that plans should take a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Policy HAL8 makes no reference to the strategic policy SWDP 5A (Green Infrastructure).</p> <p>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):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. For greenfield sites exceeding 1ha (gross) - 40% Green Infrastructure</li><li>ii. For greenfield sites of less than 1ha but more than 0.2ha (gross) – 20% Green Infrastructure.</li><li>iii. For brownfield sites – no specific Green Infrastructure (GI) figure.</li></ul>
--	--

	<p>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.</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. A robust, independent assessment of community and technical need shows the specific GI typology to be surplus to requirements in that location; and</li><li>ii. Replacement of, or investment in, GI of at least equal community and technical benefit is secured.</li></ul> <p>Comments about Policy HAL8 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Paragraph 7.21 suggests that the extent of the proposed Green Infrastructure (Map 13) is based on Maps 10 (Ancient tree records + notable trees identified by parishioners), 11 (Landscape Character Types), 15 (Biodiversity Action Plan habitat core areas and dispersal extent) and 16 (Ponds) and 17 (Community facilities and local shops). Is Map 13 an</li></ul>
--	--

	<p>amalgam of those maps or is the extent of Green Infrastructure on Map 15 based on Worcestershire County Council’s Environmental Character Areas (ECAs); ‘Protect and Restore’ and ‘Protect and Enhance’? Clarification on the basis of Map 13 would be helpful to establish the extent to which Policy HAL 8 is in general conformity with SWDP 5C.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not clear why the proposed GI network includes large areas of intensively managed arable land.</li> <li>• Text in the second sentence of paragraph 7.21 needs to be corrected. Reference to “Maps 10, 11 and 15 – 17” presumably refers to “Maps 9, 10 and 14 – 16” in the latest version of the NDP?</li> <li>• The Green Infrastructure provision on Map 13 appears to cover ‘strategic GI’ but does not cover localised and/or urban green space opportunities/issues/threats. It is suggested that the policy could be amended to cover urban green spaces or that reference is made to the fact that urban green spaces would be covered by SWDP 38 (Green Space) or its successor policy.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Policy HAL9 – Biodiversity</b></p> <p>New development should provide a net gain in biodiversity, by:</p> <p>a) Retaining existing wildlife habitats and landscape features (such as woodland, ancient, and notable trees (Table 9 and</p>	<p><b>Policy HAL9 – Biodiversity</b></p> <p>Policy HAL9 proposes that all new development proposals should provide a net gain in biodiversity by incorporating the following 5 features:</p>

<p>Map 14), watercourses, ponds, unimproved grassland, and orchards) to support biodiversity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b) Creating new wildlife habitats</li> <li>c) Including native flora in new planting such as hedgerows, landscaping, and open spaces.</li> <li>d) Creating a biodiversity-friendly environment by including features such as bat boxes, bird boxes, nest cups, and bee bricks; and</li> <li>e) By including wildlife friendly boundary treatments that facilitate the movement of species.</li> </ul> <p>Residents of new dwellings should be provided with information on the biodiversity features integrated into new housing development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Retaining existing wildlife habitats and landscape features (e.g. woodland, ancient and notable trees, watercourses, ponds, unimproved grassland and orchards) to be retained;</li> <li>b) Creating new wildlife habitats;</li> <li>c) Including native flora in hedgerows, landscaping and open spaces;</li> <li>d) Creating a biodiversity-friendly environment (by including features such as bat boxes, bird boxes, nest cups, and bee bricks); and</li> <li>e) Including wildlife friendly boundary treatments that facilitate the movement of species.</li> </ul> <p>Residents of new dwellings to be provided with information on the biodiversity features integrated into their new home.</p> <p>The reasoned justification (paragraph 7.31) says that a preliminary ecological appraisal should be prepared by a competent ecologist to advise on the most expedient and appropriate measures for each site.</p> <p>Paragraph 170d 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>It is considered that not all development proposals, particularly small-scale developments, would be able to achieve all the requirements a) to e).</p> <p>It is suggested that the wording of the policy be amended to say that should “<b>demonstrable</b> biodiversity net gain”, otherwise decision makers will not know whether the net gain is likely to be delivered.</p> <p>It is suggested that HAL9a) should include reference to hedgerows.</p> <p>Planning Practice Guidance says that 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. The relevance of some of the references in the Reasoned Justification do not appear to be relevant to Policy HAL9, including reference to Map 11 (Landscape Character Types) in paragraph 7.28 and SWDP 7 (Infrastructure) in paragraph 7.31.</p> <p>It is unclear what status Map 15 (BAP habitat areas) has in Policy HAL9 as the retention or protection of these is not specifically referenced in the policy, unlike notable trees which are referenced in HAL9a).</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</p>
--	--

	<p>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>
<h2>8. Community and Recreation Facilities</h2>	
<p><b>Policy HAL10 – Community Facilities and Local Shops</b></p> <p>The following community facilities identified and shown on the Policies Map and Map 17 are protected.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">HAL10/1 – Church of St Philip and St James</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">HAL10/2 – Hallow Parish Hall</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">HAL10/3 - The Crown Inn</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">HAL10/4 – Hallow Sports and Social Club</p> <p>Proposals that would result in the loss of these community facilities will only be supported if the criteria set out in SWDP Policy 37B (or its successor) are met.</p> <p>Proposals for enhancement of the identified community facilities or new community facilities, particularly health facilities, will be supported when positively assessed in relation to SWDP Policy 37A (or its successor).</p>	<p><b>Policy HAL10 – Community Facilities and Local Shops</b></p> <p>Policy HAL9 has 3 parts.</p> <p>Part 1 of Policy HAL10 resists the loss of 4 existing community facilities (identified on Map 17) unless it can be demonstrated that the proposal meets the criteria in SWDP Policy 37B (or its successor).</p> <p>The 4 community facilities are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Church of St Philip and St James</li> <li>2. Hallow Parish Hall</li> <li>3. The Crown Inn</li> <li>4. Hallow Sports and Social Club</li> </ol> <p>Part 2 of Policy HAL10 supports the enhancement of the 4 community facilities and development of new community facilities, particularly health facilities, subject to criteria in SWDP Policy 37A (or its successor) being met.</p>

<p>The following local shops identified and shown on the Policies Map and Map 17 will be protected:</p> <p>HAL10/5 - Post Office Stores</p> <p>HAL10/6 - Ladygo stores</p> <p>Proposals for change of use of these local shops to non-retail uses will only be supported when consistent with SWDP Policy 10.</p>	<p>Part 3 of Policy HAL10 resists the loss of 2 existing local shops (identified on Map 17) unless it can be demonstrated that the proposal meets the criteria in SWDP Policy 10.</p> <p>The 2 local shops are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Post Office Stores</li> <li>2. Ladygo stores</li> </ol> <p>Paragraph 92 of the Framework says planning policies should plan positively for community facilities and guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services.</p> <p>Map 17 helpfully shows the location of the community facilities and shops that are to be protected under Policy HAL10 (although the numbering of the facilities could be made clearer).</p> <p>It is considered that Part 1 of Policy HAL10 is in general conformity with SWDP 37B.</p> <p>It is considered that Part 2 of Policy HAL10 is in general conformity with SWDP 37A.</p> <p>It is considered that Part 3 of Policy HAL10 is in general conformity with SWDP 10. For consistency with other parts of HAL10, it is suggested that Part 3 says “SWDP 10 (or its successor)”</p>
<p><b>Policy HAL11 – Recreation</b></p> <p>The following recreation facilities, <del>also</del> shown on the Policies Map and Map 18 will be protected.</p>	<p><b>Policy HAL11 – Recreation</b></p> <p>Policy resists the loss of 5 existing recreation facilities (identified on Map 18) unless it can be demonstrated that the proposal meets the criteria in SWDP Policy 38 (Green Space).</p>

<p>HAL11/1 – Playing Fields and pavilion          HAL11/2 - Hollybank and children’s playground          HAL11/3 - Scout hut          HAL11/4 – Hallow Tennis Club          HAL11/5 – Allotments</p> <p>Development affecting these sites will be considered against SWDP Policy 38.</p>	<p>The 5 recreation facilities are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Playing Fields and pavilion</li> <li>2. Hollybank and children’s playground</li> <li>3. Scout hut</li> <li>4. Hallow Tennis Club</li> <li>5. Allotments</li> </ol> <p>It should be noted that HAL11/1, HAL11/3 and HAL11/4 are already designated as Green Space in the SWDP and therefore protected under SWDP 38. HAL 11/2 and HAL 11/5 are not currently designated as Green Space.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.11 says that the Parish Council will support improvements to key facilities. Given that some of the proposed recreation facilities meet the definition of community facilities, it is unclear why proposals for development affecting these sites would be assessed against SWDP 38 (Green Space) rather than SWDP 37A (which would relate to the enhancement of the facilities).</p>
<p><b>Potential Actions for Parish Council</b></p> <p><u>Protection of community assets</u></p> <p>To support the maintenance of village facilities (shops, schools, public houses, churches, recreational facilities) the Parish Council will nominate or support nomination of local facilities as Assets of Community Value. Once identified such assets, if put up for sale, are subject to a local community opportunity to purchase at market value. There are no Hallow properties currently on the register.</p>	<p>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.”</p> <p>The designation of Assets of Community Value is an entirely separate process to neighbourhood planning. This is recognised in the Neighbourhood Plan which makes clear that this is an action for the Parish Council and is not a land-use policy.</p>
<p><b>9. Built Heritage</b></p>	

### **Policy HAL12 – Hallow Conservation Area**

All development should preserve Hallow Conservation Area (Map 19) within the setting of Hallow’s semi-rural character. New development should:

- a) Maintain the historic pattern of built form and open spaces by respecting the pre-dominant character and architectural style of the historic zone (as identified in the Hallow Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (MHDC 2009), within which the development is situated, such as The Green and Hallow Park.
- b) Complement and be sympathetic to the scale, height, and massing of existing historic development in the context of both the immediate surrounding area (i.e., the defined zone in which the development is to be situated) and the wider Conservation Area.
- c) Retain and reflect the fenestration and roof height, design and orientation found in the elevations of the historic zone and adjacent traditional buildings.
- d) Retain, replace, employ key features such as window openings, sash windows, local detailing, and architectural decoration.
- e) Retain existing road, street, and lane patterns e.g., Church Lane.
- f) Use high-quality local and traditional materials sympathetic to the building and historic zone within which the development is

### **Policy HAL12 – Hallow Conservation Area**

Policy HAL12 seeks to preserve or enhance Hallow Conservation Area (shown on Map 21) and its setting by requiring proposals for new development to adhere to 11 principles, summarised below:

- a) Maintain the historic pattern of built form and open spaces;
- b) Complement and be sympathetic to the scale, height and massing of existing historic development;
- c) Retain and reflect the fenestration and roof height, design and orientation found in the elevations of the historic zone and adjacent traditional buildings;
- d) Retain, replace, employ key features such as window openings, sash windows, local detailing and architectural decoration;
- e) Retain existing road, street and lane patterns;
- f) Use high-quality local and traditional materials sympathetic to the building and historic zone;
- g) Retain historic building plot and field boundaries;
- h) Retain key elements of public realm. Where opportunities arise removal of unsympathetic elements of the public realm;
- i) Protect important views into and out of the Conservation Area and between buildings;
- j) Retain mature trees, landscaping and hedges, public and private green spaces (including private gardens); and

<p>situated (these include, but are not limited to, clay tile, brick, render and timber).</p> <p>g) Retain historic building plot and field boundaries, and where these include replacement boundary treatments, such treatments are of good quality and appropriate by way of materials (brick, fencing, hedges), design (informal e.g., hedges and formal e.g., walls) and construction to the building plot and those of adjacent building plots.</p> <p>h) Retain key elements of public realm (e.g., the K6 telephone kiosk) and where new public realm is proposed this should seek to retain the area's semi-rural character through its design and use of materials. Where opportunities arise removal of unsympathetic elements of the public realm e.g., highway and telecommunications infrastructure.</p> <p>i) Protect the important views into and out of the Conservation Area and between buildings as identified in the Hallow Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy. See also Policy HAL3.</p> <p>j) Retain mature trees, landscaping and hedges, public and private green spaces (including private gardens). Within a building plot the ratio of buildings to open space should be broadly retained to preserve the area's predominant open, green character. If opportunities arise to create new open areas these should use sympathetic materials for their boundaries and surfacing, so that they are appropriate to a semi-rural location and avoid introducing urban designs, styles, and materials; and</p> <p>k) Where possible and appropriate, remove and replace negative features within the Conservation Area that are the</p>	<p>k) Where possible and appropriate, remove and replace negative features within the Conservation Area that are the product of previous unsympathetic development or alterations.</p> <p>Paragraph 184 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. Paragraph 200 of the Framework says that local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably.</p> <p>Paragraph 201 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 195 or less than substantial harm under paragraph 196, 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.</p> <p>Policy Hal12 appears to have regard to the Framework.</p>
---	--

<p>product of previous unsympathetic development or alterations, e.g., car parking and drive surfaces, windows, uPVC conservatories, boundary treatments and unsympathetic domestic extensions.</p>	
<p><b>Policy HAL13 – Non-designated Heritage Assets</b></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, 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>Where a proposal would result in harm to the significance of a non-designated heritage asset the scale of the harm and the significance of the asset must be balanced against the benefits of the proposal</p>	<p><b>Policy HAL13 – Non-designated Heritage Assets</b></p> <p>Policy HAL13 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 184 of the Framework requires that historic assets should be conserved in a manner that is appropriate to their significance.</p> <p>Policy HAL13 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 9.16 of the Reasoned Justification makes it clear that the Local List will be designated and maintained by Malvern Hills District Council. It is considered appropriate for the Parish Council to nominate non-designated heritage assets for consideration in the MHDC Local List SPD through the neighbourhood plan process.</p> <p>Appendix 3 lists 30 non-designated heritage assets that the Parish Council will wish to nominate. It is considered that this is appropriate because it allows for the possibility that some nominated assets may not be adopted on the Local List and would allow for the possibility that additional assets may be listed by the District Council.</p> <p>Paragraph 9.16 helpfully makes clear that the Parish Council have sought to identify potential non-designated heritage assets that meet the criteria in the Local List SPD (May 2015).</p>

	<p>For accuracy, it is suggested that the words “by the Parish Council” be inserted between “identified” and “in” in the penultimate sentence in paragraph 9.16.</p>
<p><b>Policy HAL14 – Archaeological Assets</b></p> <p>Development proposals should conserve or enhance known surface and sub-surface archaeology included in the Worcestershire Historic Environment Record.</p> <p>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>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><b>Policy HAL14 – Archaeological Assets</b></p> <p>Policy HAL14 requires all development proposals to conserve or enhance known surface and subsurface archaeology that are included in the Worcestershire Historic Environment Record (HER).</p> <p>Policy HAL14 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 189 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 Policy HAL14 has regard to the Framework and is in general conformity with SWDP 24.</p> <p>Paragraph 9.18 says that the Worcestershire Historic Environment Record Search (HERS) lists the known archaeological remains in the area. In order to provide greater certainty for applicants and to enable decision makers to apply Policy HAL14 consistently and with greater confidence it would be helpful if these sites of archaeological interest were listed in the Policy or an Appendix and their location was shown on a map in the NDP.</p>
<p><b>Supporting Action for Parish Council</b></p> <p><u>Local List</u></p> <p>Hallow Parish Council will submit to MHDC a list of non-designated heritage assets (Appendix 3) for consideration as additions to the MHDC Local List.</p>	<p>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.”</p> <p>It is considered that the Parish Council action is clearly identifiable as a non land use matter.</p>
<p><b>10. Transport and Infrastructure</b></p>	
<p><b>Policy HAL15 – Sustainable Transport</b></p> <p>New development should seek to reduce reliance on the private car and increase opportunities for active travel (use of public transport, walking and cycling) by incorporating measures that improve facilities, infrastructure and the environment for pedestrians, cyclists, public transport and its users. In particular, the following will be supported:</p>	<p><b>Policy HAL15 – Sustainable Transport</b></p> <p>Policy HAL15 supports sustainable transport (use of public transport, walking and cycling) by encouraging new development to improve facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport.</p> <p>Policy HAL15 provides in-principle support for the following 6 transport initiatives:</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Provision of a cycle route on the eastern side of the village. This will also form a safe route for children cycling to and from the Primary School. Where relevant and feasible new development should include a marked cycle path to link into this new route.</li> <li>ii. Creation of a dedicated off-road cycle route to Worcester.</li> <li>iii. Enhanced bus transport infrastructure.</li> <li>iv. Creation of opportunities for shared transport.</li> <li>v. Improved pedestrian and cycle links to key facilities identified in the HNBP.</li> <li>vi. Improvements and new connections to existing Public Rights of Way (PROW) (Table 7, Map 20) and the creation of new PROW.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. A cycle route on the eastern side of the village. It is proposed that new development should include a cycle path to link into this route (where relevant and feasible).</li> <li>ii. A dedicated on-road cycle route to Worcester.</li> <li>iii. Enhanced bus transport infrastructure.</li> <li>iv. Creation of opportunities for shared transport.</li> <li>v. Improved pedestrian and cycle links to key facilities identified in the Neighbourhood Plan.</li> <li>vi. Improvements and new connections to existing Public Rights of Way (PROW) (Table 7 and Map 20) and the creation of new PROW.</li> </ul> <p>The intentions of Policy HAL15 are laudable, albeit opportunities to incorporate measures to improve facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport are only likely to exist in larger developments or a group of dwellings.</p> <p>Whilst Policy HAL15 provides in-principle support for a cycle route on the eastern side of the village and the creation of a dedicated off-road cycle route to Worcester, the Neighbourhood Plan does not appear to include a map showing where these cycle routes should be. As a consequence, it will be difficult for decision makers to apply the policy consistently and with confidence.</p> <p>Further, paragraph 10.5 says that the “existing Broadheath-Hallow Loop” is an example of off-road cycling infrastructure which would be supported. The text says this is shown between points 15 and 16 on Map 20. Map 20, however, does not appear to show points 15 and 16.</p>
---	---

	<p>Map 20 does, however, helpfully show the location where improvements to the PROW network would be supported.</p>
<p><b>Supporting Action for Parish Council</b></p> <p><u>Improved bus services</u></p> <p>To work with Worcestershire County Council and service providers to improve the frequency of services serving Hallow.</p>	<p>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.”</p> <p>The provision of bus services is a non-land use matter. It is considered that the Neighbourhood Plan makes clear that the proposed work with the County Council regarding bus services would be an action for the Parish Council and not a land-use policy.</p>
<p><b>11. Monitoring and Review</b></p>	
<p><b>Glossary of Terms</b></p>	
<p><b>Appendices</b></p>	
	<p>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.</p>

	<p>In light of the above it may be more appropriate to include the Potential Actions for the Parish Council as an Appendix, although it is clear in the Plan that the proposed actions for the Parish Council are non land use policies</p>
--	---