

Good Afternoon,

I hope it is ok to send this in as an email.

Please find below a list of comments relating to the Reg 16 Leigh & Bransford Neighbourhood Plan.

- 1 The area for Leigh Sinton in the NP does not collate with the area shown on the SWDP
- 2 It seems the councils are really up for destroying the English Villages and trying to turn them into Towns
- 3 Surely the housing development in Bluebell Way and the CALA Development meets SW quota
- 4 The NP does not meet the criteria of the NPPF 2021
- 5 NPPF 2021 has not been adhered to
- 6 The NP does not meet the criteria of the NPPF 2021
- 7 It is evident that the writer has not visited the proposed site in relation to heritage, biodiversity, landscape and design
- 8 There is very little employment, amenities and public transport in Leigh Sinton so therefore by building houses there is going to be an increase in commuting traffic which is not needed.
- 9 All valid points? Which don't seem to have been considered
- 10 Policy not in line with SWDP
- 11 The Mr Grove has indicated that prime farming areas should not be destroyed just to meet so called targets and that "Brown Field" sites should be used.
- 12 30% increase in housing since 2017 and Councils still want to build more
- 13 Indicative Housing Requirement will probably fall away due to the Government rethink. Therefore the time and money wasted on this document, which should be put **on hold**, is not acceptable to tax payers.

- 14 The residence of Leigh Sinton do not have a requirement for a "community sports" facility. If the Council reviews the numbers in the last census it is evident that the major of the residents fall outside the age demographic to use such a facility. This will only increase the disruptive noise for the elderly in the village and the Care Home.
- 15 It is clear that local drainage issues has not been taken into account
- 16 How many members of the Leigh and Bransford Badgers Football Club actually live in the Leigh Sinton? The proposal is more suited for a town rather than a village.
- 17 It is stated that about 16% of Leigh Sinton are under the age of 20 therefore the reasoning for 5.1.18 is invalid
- 18 Why is there an insistence by the Council that the village has to grow?
- 19 And the Council wants to increase the vehicle numbers by building another 52 houses. Where is the rationale?

- 20
- 21 Flooding - What is happening with regards to the yearly flooding of the fields in the proposed Development Boundary?
- 22 It begs belief that the cellular signals in Leigh Sinton are virtually none existent.
- 23 Land floods every year. Definitely not a Flood zone 1
- 24 Due to speeding issues, school and volume of traffic. Site will not have a safe access

- 25 Has hydraulic modelling been done by Severn Trent ? What will the effect of the proposed housing be on the water pressure and what is been done to the sewage issues within the village
- 26 No up to date Ecological Survey results have been published. Evidence of bats, newts, skylarks and other protected species have been noted by residents
- 27 Needs to be assessed during periods of heavy rainfall and solution needs to be published
- 28 Contaminated Land to be investigated
- 29 Why are Councils adamant about destroying English Villages?
- 30 Who is to own, repair, maintain and take ownership of the potion of the moat which is in the proposed area?
- 31 Overhead Electrical line???
- 32 Large gate access to properties adjacent to proposed area needs to be kept
- 33 Flooding due to Moat overflow
- 34 Noise and dust during construction
- 36 Crime figures will increase in the area due to additional housing
- 37 Speeding and vehicle volume will increase, large concern at present
- 38 There is a watercourse within 20m and flooding does occur
- 39 Who is going to take responsibility for the maintenance for the outlet from the moat.
- 40 The moat outfall runs across the proposed development, this needs to be investigated and protected before construction begins. i.e. trial holes and confirmation of "Fit for Purpose" is required
- 41 Who will be responsible for the maintenance of the outfall pipe?
- 42 Finished ground levels are required to be lower than existing properties so as not to flood these properties
- 43 Flood alleviation of the moat at the east end shall be no higher than 100mm above the invert of the outfall pipe
- 44 The application for a further 52 residential properties in Leigh Sinton is not in line with the environment since there are limited amenities in the village, therefore commuting for work, for shopping etc will be necessary. Development should be directed at "Brown Field" site (as recommended by the Government) in existing towns where travel is easily available without the use of a car and not on rural "Green Field" sites.
- 45 The A4103 has a large number of vehicles travelling along it, there have been numerous accidents at the 2 existing T junctions and a crossing will just block up the village which will cause further traffic incidents. T junction across from a school is inconceivable. It has been proven in the village that vehicles do not abide to the rules of the road and the vehicles jumping the crossing will put children's lives at risk. A present traffic survey of the A4103 and main T junctions should be sort before the application is decided upon.
- 46 Bus numbers (3/4 per day) maybe suitable for a rural community but not for a village that it continually been extended. No bus route goes to Malvern which is the closest shopping area.
- 47 The Government has recommended that "Brown Field" site should be investigated before "Green Field" site. Most "Brown Field" sites are commonly found in Towns and cities therefore protecting the villages from being destroyed by Developers and Councils. Brown Field sites normally have all utilities and amenities already in place.

- 48 The village does not require the sports/open space facility since most of the residents would not use it due to age demographic for the Village (especially around the proposed location, majority of residents are retired and this will vastly decrease their quality of life in their later years). As per the last census, 18% of the Village is under 20 years of age. It seems the facility would be for the surrounding villages rather than Leigh Sinton. A more advantageous solution would be to create a wood by planting trees in this area or leave it as prime farm land.
- 49 Who will adopted the moat and maintain the trees and vegetation within the moat area of the proposal?
- 50 I believe the Primary School is already over subscribed and therefore children will need to be commuted to other school
- 51 A "simulated" crossing should be erected at the proposed crossing of the A4103 and findings appraised. With 52 houses there will be approx. 100 crossings a day due to the amenities i.e. School, pub, shop, post office and take away all being on the other side of the A4103. I suspect that the Village will become grid locked at certain times of the day and potentially a traffic incident will occur where someone will be hurt or even killed crossing the road due to frustration of drivers who will not have patience stopping at the crossing and pulling out of the T junctions are previously stated. There is high quantity of HG's coming along the A4103
- 52 The statement that there is no traffic problems within the Village is completely untrue. Please explain why this item is brought up at every Community Meeting with the District Councillors and the need for "Speed crows" and traffic calming displays.
- 53 The majority of the elderly of the village have not commented on the Plan due to their age. A simple tick sheet should maybe sent to all retired residence to get their feelings rather than reems of paper and policies, **they should not be ignored.**
- 54 I believe that Leigh Sinton is no longer in the Bransford Neighbourhood Area surely the Plan needs to be transferred to the new Neighbourhood Area
- 55 Michael Grove also stated on TV at the weekend that developments, like the Parish council have suggested, should be stopped because of the reduction of farm land, lack of amenities and infrastructure in the Village and housing targets do not have to be complied with.

I hope that all the above comments/questions will be reviewed and replied too.

Kind Regards

Kevin Darby