

## HALLOW NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN REGULATION 16

### COMMENTS TO EXAMINER ON REG 16 COMMENTS RECEIVED

Hallow Parish Council welcomes the opportunity to provide comment on the Reg 16 comments submitted to MHDC as part of the NDP consultation process. We understand that this is not an opportunity to submit additional evidence.

Our comments are focused on:

- Comments that enable Hallow PC to improve an existing policy wording or fact check.
- Comments that may have arisen from a misunderstanding of evidence or report wording.
- Comments that present new material.

RESPONDENT NUMBER	ORGANISATION, AGENCY OR PERSON	COMMENT	HPC RESPONSE
1	MHDC	Comments in respect of clarification and redundant sentences, and map corrections in Sections 1-5 of the HNDDP. See pages 4-5 of the MHDC response.	Amend the HNDDP as suggested. On the Policies Map, this is at a scale too large to include within the A4/A3 written document. There is no requirement for the Policies Map to be within the body of the HNDDP. No change should be made as a result of this comment.
	MHDC	Comments on Policy HAL1, pages 5-8 of MHDC response.	MHDC's confirmation that the proposed site at Land at Green Hill Lane conforms with SWDP2 (Development Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy) is welcomed.

RESPONDENT NUMBER	ORGANISATION, AGENCY OR PERSON	COMMENT	HPC RESPONSE
			<p>The acknowledgment that evidence provided by the Parish Council in correspondence from Cadent and the Health &amp; Safety Executive removing any constraint to the development of the site is also welcomed.</p> <p>Confirmation that the site is also capable of meeting the minimum indicative housing figure for Hallow is also welcomed.</p> <p>HNDP1c is included to ensure that a connection, <b>or potential connection</b> is made to the cycle loop. This will enable any future residents to use alternatives to the private car and will help provide opportunities for recreation and make a contribution to health and well being. The cycle loop bounds the allocated site to the north and east.</p> <p>Comments on paragraphs 6.5 and 6.6 of the HNDP noted, but the SWDPR is only an “emerging” plan. Update where necessary as information on SWDPR changes.</p> <p>Comment on paragraph 6.7 noted, no change.</p> <p>Amend 6.8 to 6.10 as suggested.</p>

RESPONDENT NUMBER	ORGANISATION, AGENCY OR PERSON	COMMENT	HPC RESPONSE
			<p>Comment on 6.11 noted, no change. The figures are indicative and <b>theoretically</b> there are no dwellings to find.</p> <p>Comment on 6.12 noted, no change.</p> <p>Table 4 shows past housing delivery in the neighbourhood area and is crucial to understanding how delivery has exceeded policy requirements in Hallow, and is a key part of the narrative in helping residents understand the rationale for housing land to be allocated in the HNDP.</p> <p>Similarly, Figure 7 is included to help residents, in particular, understand how and why decisions by the Parish Council have been taken. Figure 7 should remain in the plan.</p> <p>Amend bullet point 1, paragraph 6.14 as suggested. Comment on bullet point 2 noted, no change.</p> <p>For response on bullet point 6, see response in relation to HAL1c.</p>
	MHDC	HAL2 Housing Need	<p>Amend paragraph 6.16 to read:</p> <p>“In the context of current market conditions and development plan policy, housing allocation HAL1/1</p>

Hallow NDP, Hallow Parish Council Comments to Examiner, March 2021

RESPONDENT NUMBER	ORGANISATION, AGENCY OR PERSON	COMMENT	HPC RESPONSE
			should be able to provide a range of types of housing to meet such demand and need. Other proposals of 5 or more units should also include a mix of new homes.”
	MHDC	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.	Applicants must demonstrate proposals should respond to the full Hallow Design Guide prepared by AECOM.
	MHDC	Paragraph 6.29 refers to a report titled “Living with Beauty” produced by the building Better, Building Beautiful Commission. It is not clear 13 what the relevance of this document is to Policy HAL3. It is suggested that this paragraph should be deleted.	The Commission was an independent body that advised government on how to promote and increase the use of high-quality design for new build homes and neighbourhoods. It is relevant to refer to this document as part of the national drive to improve design standards.
	MHDC	HAL4	Comment on HAL4d noted, no change.  Paragraphs 7.4-7.10 are considered to adequately demonstrate how the NDP’s substantial evidence base has been used to inform and develop Policy HAL4 amongst others.

Hallow NDP, Hallow Parish Council Comments to Examiner, March 2021

RESPONDENT NUMBER	ORGANISATION, AGENCY OR PERSON	COMMENT	HPC RESPONSE
			Alternative policy wording noted, no change.
	MHDC	HAL 5	Comments on HAL5 noted, no change.
	MHDC	HAL 6 Map 13	Include larger scale plans of Local Green Spaces.
	MHDC	<p>HAL 6</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 Local Green Spaces will not be supported except in very special circumstances."</p>	<p>The heading for Table 7 includes a "note" regarding reference numbers which relate to the original LGS assessment. This should be retained to enable other plan users to cross-reference with the evidence base.</p> <p>Amend accompanying maps for Policy HAL6 as suggested.</p> <p>In relation to the following comment</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 Local Green Spaces will not be supported except in very special circumstances."'</p>

RESPONDENT NUMBER	ORGANISATION, AGENCY OR PERSON	COMMENT	HPC RESPONSE
			<p>This is a misreading of national planning policy. Paragraph 145 sets out some forms of development that may not be inappropriate in the Green Belt. Where development is considered inappropriate (paragraph 143 of NPPF), this should only be approved in “very special circumstances”. No change to Policy HAL6.</p>
		<p>HAL 7 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.</p>	<p>See previous comment on the Policies Map.</p>

RESPONDENT NUMBER	ORGANISATION, AGENCY OR PERSON	COMMENT	HPC RESPONSE
		HAL 8 Green Infrastructure	<p>Map 13 is an amalgam of Maps 10 (Ancient tree records + notable trees identified by parishioners), Map 11 (Landscape Character Types), Map 15 (Biodiversity Action Plan habitat core areas and dispersal extent) and Map 16 (Ponds).</p> <p>The NDP does not identify large areas of arable land as GI <i>per se</i>, such areas are identified as part of the GI network as they are within the key GI corridors of the River Severn and the land around and linking to Spindlewood.</p> <p>Correct text as suggested.</p> <p>Urban green spaces are covered by other NDP and development plan policy, no change.</p>
		HAL 9	<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>Comment noted, but policy includes “should” – no change.</p> <p>The policy should be amended to say that should “demonstrable biodiversity net gain”, amend as suggested.</p>

Hallow NDP, Hallow Parish Council Comments to Examiner, March 2021

RESPONDENT NUMBER	ORGANISATION, AGENCY OR PERSON	COMMENT	HPC RESPONSE
			It is suggested that HAL9a) should include reference to hedgerows. Amend as suggested.
		HAL10	Comments noted, no change.
		HAL11	Amend SWDP Policy references in paragraph 8.11.
		HAL12	No comment to make.
		HAL13	Amend paragraph 9.16 as suggested.
		HAL14	<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>This is not necessary or desirable – the HERS is regularly updated and can be consulted upon as and when necessary by applicants.</p>
8	HEREFORDSHIRE AND WORCESTERSHIRE EARTH HERITAGE TRUST	There are no designated Sites of Geological Interest within the Hallow Neighbourhood Area, and we raise no	Comments noted. No change. These matters as stated can be picked up during any relevant development management process.

Hallow NDP, Hallow Parish Council Comments to Examiner, March 2021

RESPONDENT NUMBER	ORGANISATION, AGENCY OR PERSON	COMMENT	HPC RESPONSE
		<p>objection to the planning proposals, however the river terrace deposits are of substantial interest to geologists. As well as giving clues to the early drainage of the area, they are interesting for their fossils, and for the possibility of obtaining accurate dates using newly developed technology. It is not possible to anticipate where areas of greatest interest might occur, but we would welcome the opportunity to investigate any exposures that are created during the development process.</p>	
10	SEVERN TRENT	<p>Include the following policy wording in HAL1:                      “All applications for new development shall demonstrate that all surface water discharges have been carried out in accordance with the principles laid out within the drainage hierarchy, in such that a discharge to the public sewerage systems are avoided, where possible.”</p> <p>Amend justification as follows:                      “Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be designed in accordance with</p>	Amend HAL1 as suggested.

RESPONDENT NUMBER	ORGANISATION, AGENCY OR PERSON	COMMENT	HPC RESPONSE
		<p>current industry best practice, The SuDS Manual, CIRIA (C753), to ensure that the systems deliver both the surface water quantity and the wider benefits, without significantly increasing costs. Good SuDS design can be key for creating a strong sense of place and pride in the community for where they live, work and visit, making the surface water management features as much a part of the development as the buildings and roads.”</p> <p>Amend HAL3 to include the following:</p> <p>“New Developments should demonstrate that they are water efficient, where possible incorporating innovative water efficiency and water re-use measures. Development proposals should demonstrate that the estimated consumption of wholesome water per dwelling is calculated in accordance with the methodology in the water efficiency calculator, should not exceed 110 litres/person/day.”</p> <p>HAL4 amend as follows:</p>	<p>Amend HAL3 as suggested.</p>



RESPONDENT NUMBER	ORGANISATION, AGENCY OR PERSON	COMMENT	HPC RESPONSE
		<p>should be amended though deletion or targeted redrafting prior to being sent to referendum.</p> <p>HAL 1 comments:</p> <p>The supporting text for HAL1 proceeds on the basis of a misinterpretation of NPPF 65 and 66 and the applicable supporting paragraphs of the PPG.</p> <p>Under NPPF 65 the “identified housing requirement” in a development plan document must be contained in “adopted strategic policies”.</p> <p>NPPF 66 provides an alternative route for a neighbourhood plan body to request a requirement figure, but this must “take into account factors such as the latest evidence of local housing need, the population of the neighbourhood area and the most recently available planning strategy of the local planning authority.”</p>	<p>In terms of adopted strategic planning policies these do not contain a housing requirement for Hallow.</p> <p>In terms of NPPG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The indicative figure can be tested at the neighbourhood plan examination;</li> <li>• The guidance in Paragraph 102 has been followed; and</li> <li>• The qualifying body has NOT determined their own requirement figure this has been provided by the SWDPR authorities.</li> </ul> <p>The HNDP and the site allocation contained therein exceed the indicative housing requirement identified for Hallow, therefore, there is no need to identify a further or reserve site. Should this position change the HNDP could be reviewed.</p>

RESPONDENT NUMBER	ORGANISATION, AGENCY OR PERSON	COMMENT	HPC RESPONSE
	BARTON WILMORE	HAL 2 IM Land does not propose modifications to Draft Policy HAL2, however we wish to draw attention to the contribution towards meeting the objectives of this policy that the Site west of the A443 could have.	Comment noted, no change.
	BARTON WILMORE	HAL 4 IM Land does not propose modifications to Draft Policy HAL2, however we wish to draw attention to the contribution towards meeting the objectives of this policy that the Site west of the A443 could have.	HAL4 is considered to be consistent with national planning and be in general conformity with strategic planning policy. No change.
	BARTON WILMORE	HAL 7 Draft Policy HAL7 seeks to protect key views and advises that development proposals must be sited so that they do not “substantially harm” these views. View 18 on the policies map is identified to the north of the Site.	HAL7 has been developed using a comprehensive and proportionate evidence, only part of which is the “community walkabout”. No change.  The Parish Council have not comment to make on the impact of any possible development on View 18 at this time.
	BARTON WILMORE	HAL 8 Draft Policy HAL8 seeks to maintain the Green Infrastructure (GI) identified on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan Policies Map (also shown at Map 13 of the plan). IM Land <b>strongly object</b> to the allocation of such a significant	This response is contradictory it questions the Policy HAL8 and the substantial evidence base upon which it is based. But then seeks a modification to remove the respondent’s client’s site. Policy HAL8 is either fundamentally flawed, which the Parish Council contend that it is not; or it

RESPONDENT NUMBER	ORGANISATION, AGENCY OR PERSON	COMMENT	HPC RESPONSE
		<p>amount of GI, particularly on Land west of the A443. Its continued inclusion would be a clear breach of basic conditions 8(2)(a), (d) and (e).</p>	<p>is simply a question of how GI boundaries have been drawn.</p> <p>On this latter point the Parish Council's position is that (and this is set out in the HNPD and supporting documents) HAL8 is based on a robust and proportionate evidence base. No change.</p>
12	CLAREMONT PLANNING	<p>HAL 1 "it can be confirmed that the requirements set out by Policy HAL1 are deliverable."</p> <p>Para 6.6.-6.6</p> <p>Para 6.14 Claremont Planning can confirm on behalf of Mactaggart and Mickel Ltd that the information presented in paragraph 6.24 is correct. Through the co-operation between the South Worcestershire Councils and the Parish Council, the suitability of the land at Green Hill Land has been established; which has formed the basis for the site allocation HAL1/1. These discussions have involved confirmation that the gas main beyond the site to the south is not a constraint that restricts development,</p>	<p>Support noted and the confirmation that the requirements of Policy HAL1 are deliverable are welcomed.</p> <p>Supporting comments noted.</p> <p>Supporting comment noted.</p>

RESPONDENT NUMBER	ORGANISATION, AGENCY OR PERSON	COMMENT	HPC RESPONSE
		<p>rather that open space can be located to provide the necessary off-set from the gas main; whilst also providing a large open space that distinguishes development on the housing allocation to the delivered housing development to the south.</p> <p>HAL2, Para 6.16-6.19</p> <p>Design Guide</p>	<p>Comments on HAL2 to noted – the policy does not prescribe a mix for housing development. It sets a policy framework for how on-site mix should be identified and implemented. No change.</p> <p>Comments noted. No change.</p>
13	PLACE PARTNERSHIP ON BEHALF OF WCC	<p>HAL 1 WCC objects to the removal of the housing allocation for its land lying to the south of Tinkers Coppice Farm under Policy HAL1 of the draft Hallow Neighbourhood Development Plan (HNDP).</p> <p>The HNDP proposes the replacement of CFS0343sc with 'Land at Greenhill Lane'. This is a frankly mystifying and unreasonable decision, given that the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) did not</p>	<p>Land lying to the south has never been a housing allocation, it was an option considered in emerging planning policy.</p> <p>The respondent's site was not allocated, it was an option, the HNDP has considered other options in an open and transparent manner. The gas pipeline is no longer a constraint and it is reasonable to consider and allocate an alternative site based on this significant change in circumstances. No change.</p>

RESPONDENT NUMBER	ORGANISATION, AGENCY OR PERSON	COMMENT	HPC RESPONSE
		<p>allocate the Greenhill Lane site because of its proximity to a gas pipeline.</p> <p>The approach of the HNDP is to treat the figures in paragraphs 6.9 and 6.10 as being maximum totals</p>	<p>This is incorrect, the indicative housing figure is not a maximum. The HNDP exceeds this figure. No change.</p>
	<p>PLACE PARTNERSHIP</p>	<p>HAL6/1 – ‘Tinkers Coppice Wood’ and HAL6/2 – ‘Gravel Pit’.</p>	<p>The Parish Council retain the position that the two sites fulfil the designation criteria for Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>HAL6/1 Tinkers Coppice Wood: The safety issues are acknowledged. Access to the site via the PROW is noted. The site is in reasonable proximity to the community is serves and has wildlife value as ancient woodland. No change.</p> <p>HAL6/2 – ‘Gravel Pit’- This site is regularly accessed by walkers and bird watchers with a monthly update on bird sightings in the parish magazine. It meets the criteria of access, community value and proximity. The origin of the lake through commercial mineral extraction is irrelevant.</p>

RESPONDENT NUMBER	ORGANISATION, AGENCY OR PERSON	COMMENT	HPC RESPONSE
			<p>We appreciate WCC's wish to balance this with adequate protection for nesting birds and those on the red list, however we are not aware of any past or current disturbance issues.</p> <p>The availability or lack of car parking is not a criterion for designation of Local Green Space. No change.</p>
	PLACE PARTNERSHIP	<p>HAL 8</p> <p>WCC objects to a large parcel of Tinkers Coppice Farm being designated as Green Infrastructure under this policy. The reasoning for this is as follows.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure is defined as "A network of green spaces and natural elements that intersperse and connect villages, towns and cities" under Green Infrastructure Framework 1: Context and Baseline produced by WCC. The National Planning Practice Guidance also provides clear examples of what green infrastructure can include, such as playing fields, allotments, private gardens and other areas of open space (Paragraph: 004 Reference ID: 8-004-</p>	<p>NPPF defines GI 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." This does not preclude or impede the use of land currently used for agriculture.</p>

RESPONDENT NUMBER	ORGANISATION, AGENCY OR PERSON	COMMENT	HPC RESPONSE
		<p>20190721). Given that Tinkers Coppice Farm consists of land that is mixed arable and livestock and so heavily farmed, it does not meet the criteria of acting as a corridor to link to other Green Infrastructure assets and therefore not in accordance with part (c) of Policy HAL8 for restoring or creating new infrastructure links and connections.</p> <p>GI should be multifunctional, the landholding is leased to a tenant farmer and encouraging the public to access the land through the allocation would seriously prejudice farming operations there.</p> <p>Policy HAL8 of the HNDP does not specify how the designated green infrastructure will be maintained. Consideration should also be given to the fact that the smallholding is designated as Grade 2 and 3 under the Agricultural Land Classification and is therefore classed as being of the 'best and most versatile land'.</p>	<p>GI should be multi-functional in its totality, not as independent spaces. The HNDP does not propose public access.</p> <p>There is no requirement or need to specify how GI will be maintained (the respondent's comments relate to new GI), nor will Policy HAL8 impact on the land's use for agriculture.</p>



